National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. X.---NO. 43. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1850. | WHOLE NUMBER 511.

Published Weekly.
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

Terms.
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS, PRINTER.

Selections.

GOV. SEWARD'S SPEECH
ON THE
SLAVERY QUESTION,

Delivered in the United States Senate, Monday, March 14, 1850.

Mr. Seward having the floor rose and said:

Mr. President: Four years ago. California, scarcely inhabited and quite unexplored, was unknown even to our usually immoderate desires, except by a harbor, capacious and tranquil, which only statesmen then foresaw would be useful in the Oriental commerce of a far distant if not chimerical future.

A year ago, California was a mere military depency of our own, and we were celebrating, with enthusiasm and unanimity, its acquisition, with its newly discovered but yet untold and untouched mineral wealth, as the most auspicious of many and unparalleled achievements.

To-day, California is a State, more populous than the least and richer than several of the greatest of our thirty States. The same California, thus rich and populous, is here asking admission into the Union, and finds us debating the dissolution of the Union itself. No wonder if we are perplexed with ever changing embarrassments; no wonder if we are appalled by ever increasing responsibilities! No wonder if we are bewildered by the ever augmenting magnitude and rapidity of national vicissitudes!

SHALL CALIFORNIA BE RECEIVED?

For myself, upon my individual judgment and conscience, I answer, Yes! For myself, as an instructed Representative of one of the States, of *that* one, even, of the States which is soonest and longest to be pressed into commercial and political rivalry by the new Commonwealth, I answer, Yes! Let California come in. Every new State, whether she comes from the east or from the west, coming from whatever part of the continent she may, is always welcome. But California, that comes from the clime where the West dies away into the rising East,—California, which bounds at once the Empire and the Continent,—California, the youthful Queen of the Pacific, in her robes of Freedom, gorgeously inlaid with gold, is doubly welcome.

And now I inquire, First, *Why should California be rejected?* All the objections are founded only in the circumstances of her coming, and in the organic law which she presents for our confirmation.

First, California comes unceremoniously, without a preliminary consent of Congress, and therefore by usurpation. This allegation, I think, is not quite true—at least not quite true in spirit. California is not here of her own pure volition. We tore California violently from her place in the confederation of Mexican States, and stipulated by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, that the Territory should be admitted, by States, into the American Union as speedily as possible

But the letter of the objection still holds, California *did* come without a preliminary consent by Congress to form a Constitution. But Michigan and other States presented themselves in the same unauthorized way, and Congress waived the irregularity, and sanctioned the usurpation. California pleads these precedents. Is not the plea sufficient?

But it has been said by the Hon. Senator from South Couth Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) that the ordinance of 1787, secured to Michigan the right to become a State when she would have sixty thousand inhabitants. Owing to some neglect Congress delayed to take the census; and this is said in palliation of the irregularity in the case of Michigan. But California, as has been seen, had a treaty, and Congress, instead of giving previous consent, and instead of giving her the customary territorial government, as they did to Michigan, failed to do either, and thus practically refused both, and so abandoned the new community, under most unpropitious circumstances, to anarchy. California then made a Constitution for herself; but not unnecessarily and presumptuously, as Michigan did. She made a Constitution for herself, and came under the law—the paramount law of self-preservation. I think she stands justified. Indeed, California is more than justified. She was a *Colony*—a *military* Colony. All Colonies, especially *military* Colonies, are incongruous with our political system, and they are equally open to corruption and exposed to oppression. They are therefore not more unfortunate in their own proper condition than fruitful in dangers to the parent Democracy. California then acted wisely and well in establishing self-government. She deserves not rebuke. but praise and approbation.

Nor does this objection come with a good grace from those who offer it. If California were now content to receive only a Territorial Charter, we could not agree to grant it without an inhibition of Slavery, which in that case, being a federal act of federal *authority*, would render the attitude of California as a Territory even more offensive to those who now repel her than she is as a State, even with the same inhibition in the Constitution of her own voluntary choice.

The second objection is, that California has assigned her own boundaries, without the previous authority of Congress. But she was left to organize herself, without any boundaries fixed by previous law, or by prescription. She was obliged, therefore to assume boundaries, since without boundaries she must have remained unrecognized.

A third objection is, that California is too large. I answer: first, there is no common standard of the size of States. California, though greater than many is less than one of the States. Second, California, if too large, may be divided with her own consent, and that is all the security we have for reducing the magnitude and averting the preponderance of Texas.—Thirdly, the boundaries of California seem not at all unnatural. The Territory circumscribed is altogether contiguous and compact. Fourth, the boundaries are convenient. They embrace only inhabited portions of the country, commercially connected with the port of San Francisco. No one has pretended to offer boundaries more in harmony with the physical outlines of the region concerned, or more convenient for civil administration.

But to draw closer to the question. What shall be the boundaries of a new State, concerns, first, the State herself, (and California of course is content.) Secondly, adjacent communities. Oregon does not complain of encroachment, and there is no other adjacent community to complain. Thirdly, the other States of the Union. The larger the Pacific States, the smaller will be their relative power in the Senate. All the States now here are Atlantic States and Inland States: and surely they may well indulge California in the largest liberty of boundaries.

The fourth objection to the admission of California is, that no previous census had been taken and no laws prescribing the qualification of Suffrage, and the Apportionment of Representatives in Convention existed. I answer California was left to act *abinitio*. She must begin sometime without a census and without such laws. The Pilgrim Fathers began in the same way on board the May-Flower: and since it is objected that some of the electors in California may have been aliens, I add that all the Pilgrim Fathers were aliens and strangers to the Commonwealth of Plymouth.

Again, the objection may well be received if the Constitution of California is satisfactory—first, to herself, and secondly, to the United States. As regards the first of these not a murmur of discontent has followed California to this place: and as to ourselves, we confine our inquiries about the Constitution with a view to four things: First, the boundaries assumed; and I have considered that point in this case already. Second, that the domain in this State is secured to us; and it is admitted that this has been done—properly done. Third, that the Constitution shall be Republican and not aristocratic or monarchial. In this case the only objection is that the Constitution, inasmuch as it inhibits Slavery, is altogether too Republican. Fourth, that the Representation claimed shall be just and equal. No one denies that the population of California is sufficient to demand two Representatives on the Federal basis; and, secondly, a new census is at hand, and the error, if there be one, will be immediately corrected.

The fifth objection is, that California comes under Executive influences—first, in her coming as a Free State, and second in her coming at all. The first charge rests on suspicion, only—is peremptorily denied, and the denial is not controverted by proofs. I dismiss it altogether. The second is true to the extent that the present President advised the People of California that, having been left without any civil government under the military supervision of the Executive without any authority of law whatever, the adoption of a Constitution subject to the approval of Congress, would be regarded favorably by the President.

Only a year ago it was complained that the exercise of the military power to maintain law and order in California was a fearful innovation; but now the wind has changed, and blows even stronger from the opposite quarter. May this Republic never have a President commit a more serious or more dangerous usurpation of power than the act of the present eminent Chief Magistrate in endeavoring to induce the legislative authorities to relieve him from the exercise of military power, by establishing civil institutions regulated by law in distant provinces. Rome would have been standing this day if she had had such generals and such magistrates.

But the objection, whether true in part or even in the whole, is immaterial. The question is not what moved California to impress any particular feature in her Constitution, nor even what induced her to adopt a Constitution at all: but it is whether, since she had adopted a Constitution she shall be admitted into the Union?

I have now reviewed all the objections raised against the admission of California. It is seen that they have no foundation in the law of nature and of nations. Nor are they founded in the Constitution, for the Constitution prescribes no form or manner of proceeding in the admission of new States, but leaves the whole to the discretion of Congress. "Congress may admit new States." The objections are all merely formal and technical. They rest on precedents which have not always, nor even generally, been observed.

But it is said that we ought now to establish a safe precedent for the future; I answer it is too late to seize this occasion for that purpose. the irregularity complained of being unavoidable. The caution should have been exercised, first, when Texas was annexed; second, when we waged war against Mexico; or third, when we ratified the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Again: we may establish precedents at pleasure. Our successors will exercise their pleasure about following them, just as we have done in such cases. Third: States, Nations and Empires are apt to be peculiarly capricious, not only as to the time, but even as to the *manner* of their being born, and as to their subsequent political changes. They are not accustomed to conform to precedents. California sprung from the head of the nation, not only complete in proportions and fully armed, but ripe for affiliation with its membeus.

I proceed now to state my reasons for the opinion that California ought to be admitted. The population of the United States consists of native Caucasian origin, and Exotics of the same derivation. The Native mass rapidly assimulates to itself and absorbs the Exotic, and these therefore constitute one homogenous people. The African race, bond and free and the Aborigines, savage and civilized, being incapable of such assimilation and absorption, remain distinct, and owing to their peculiar condition constitute inferior masses, and may be regarded as accidental, if not disturbing political forces.

The ruling Homogenous family was planted at first on the Atlantic Shore, and following an obvious law is seen continually and rapidly spreading itself westward year by year, subduing the Wilderness and the Prairie, and thus extending this great political community, which as fast as it advances, breaks into distinct States for municipal purposes only, while the whole constitutes one entire contigious and compact nation.

Well established rules of political arithmetic enable us to say that the aggregate population of the nation now is 22 million; that ten years hence it will be thirty millions, 20 years hence 38 millions, 30 years hence 50 millions, 40 years hence 64 millions, 50 years hence 80 millions, and 100 years hence 200 millions! But the advance of population on the Pacific will far exceed what occurred on the Atlantic Coast, while Emigration even here is outstripping the calculation on which these estimates are based. There are silver and gold in the Mountains and Ravines in California. The Granite of New-England is barren.

Allowing due consideration to the increasing density of our population, we are safe in assuming that long before this mass shall have attained the maximum of numbers indicated, the entire width of our possessions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, will be covered by it and be brought into social maturity and complete political organization.

The question now arises, Shall this one great People, having a common origin, a common language, a common religion, common sentiments, interests, sympathies and hopes, remain one political State, one Nation, one Republic? or shall it be broken into two conflicting and probably hostile Nations or Republics? There cannot ultimately be more than two; for the habit of association is already formed, as the interests of mutual intercourse are forming, and the central portions, if they cannot all command access to both Oceans, will not be obstructed in their approaches to that one which offers the greatest facilities to their Commerce.

Shall the American people then be divided? Before deciding on this question, let us consider our position, our power, and capabilities. The world contains no seat of Empire so magnificent as this, which, while it embraces all the varying climates of the temperate zone, and is traversed by wide expanding lakes and long branching rivers, offers supplies on the Atlantic shore to the overcrowded nations of Europe, while on the Pacific Coast it intercepts the commerce of the Indies. The nation thus situated and enjoying forest, mineral and agricultural resources unequalled, if they are endowed also with moral energies adequate to the achievement of great enterprise, and favored with a Government adapted to their character and condition, must command the Empire of the Seas which alone is *real* Empire. We think that we may claim to have inherited physical and intellectual vigor, courage, invention and enterprise, and the systems of Education prevailing among us open to all the stores of human science and art.

The Old World and the Past, were allotted by Providence to the pupilage of mankind, under the hard discipline of arbitrary power quelling the violence of human passion. The New World and the Future seems to have been appointed for the maturity of mankind, with the development of self-government operating in obedience to reason and judgment. We have thoroughly tried our moral system of Democratic Federal Government with its complex yet harmonious and effective combination of distinct local elective agencies for the conduct of domestic affairs, and its common central elective agencies for the regulation of internal interests, and of intercourse with foreign nations, and we know that it is a system, equally cohesive in its parts and capable of all desirable expansion; and that it is a system, moreover perfectly adapted to secure domestic tranquility, while it brings into action all the elements of national aggrandizement.

The Atlantic States, through their commercial, social and political affinities and sympathies, are steadily renovating the Governments and the Social Constitutions of Europe and of Africa. The Pacific States must necessarily perform the same sublime and beneficent functions in Asia. If, then, the American people shall remain one individual nation, the ripening civilization of the West, after a separation growing wider and wider for four thousand years, will, in its circuit of the world, meet again and mingle with the declining civilization of the East. on our own free soil, and a new and more perfect civilization will arise to bless the earth, under the sway of our own cherished and beneficent democratic institutions. We may then reasonably hope for Greatness, Felicity and Renown excelling any hitherto attained by any nation, if standing firmly on the Continent we loose our grasp on the shore of either ocean. Whether a destiny so magnificent would be only partially defeated, or whether it would be altogether lost by a relaxation of that grasp surpasses our wisdom to determine, and happily is not important to be determined. It is enough if we agree that expectations so grand, yet so reasonable and so just, ought not to be in any degree disappointed.

And now it seems to me that the perpetual unity of our Empire hangs on the decision of this day and of this hour. California is already a State—a complete and fully appointed State—she never again can be less than that. She can never again be a Province or a Colony. Nor can she be made to shrink and shrivel into the proportions of a Federal dependent territory. California then, henceforth and forever, must be what she is now—a State. The question, whether she shall be one of the United States of America, has depended on her and on us. Her election has been made. Our consent alone remains suspended; and that consent must be pronounced now or never. I say now or never!—Nothing prevents it now but want of agreement among ourselves. Our harmony cannot increase while this question remains open. We shall never agree to admit California unless we agree now.

Nor will California abide delay. I do not say that she contemplates independence; but if she does not, it is because she does not anticipate rejection. Do you say that she can have no motive? Consider then, her attitude if rejected. She needs a Capital, a Legislature and Magistrates; she needs titles to that golden domain of ours within her borders, good titles, too. and you must give them on your own terms, or she must take them without your leave. She needs a Mint, Custom House, Wharves, Hospitals, and Institutions of Learning. She needs fortifications, roads, and railroads. She needs the protection of an army and navy. Either your stars and stripes must wave over her ports and her fleets, or she must raise aloft a standard for herself. She needs at least to know whether you are friends or enemies. And, finally, she needs what no American community can live without—sovereignty and independence—either a just and equal share of yours or sovereignty and independence of her own.

Will you say that California could not aggrandize herself by separation? Would it then be a mean ambition to set up within fifty years on the Pacific coast, monuments like those which we think two hundred years have been well spent in establishing on the Atlantic coast? Will you say that California has no ability to become independent? She has the same moral ability for enterprise that inheres in us, and that ability implies command of all physical means. She has advantages of position; she is practically further removed from you than England. We cannot reach her by railroad, or by unbroken steamboat navigation. You can send no armies over the Pacific. the Mountain and the Desert; nor across the remote and narrow isthmus, within a foreign jurisdiction; nor around the Cape of Storms. You can send a Navy there, but she has only to open her Mines and she can reduce your marines and appropriate your floating bulwarks to her own defence. Let her only seize your domain within her own borders, and your commerce in port, and she will have at once revenue and credit adequate to all her necessities. Beside, are we so moderate, and has the world become so just, that we have no rivals and no enemies to lend their sympathies and aid to compass the dismemberment of our Empire? Try not the temper or the fidelity of California, at least not now, not yet. Cherish her and indulge her until you have extended your settlements to her borders and bound her fast by railroads and canals and telegraphs to your interests; until her affinities of intercourse are established, and habits of loyalty are fixed, and then she can never be disengaged.

California would not go alone; Oregon, so intimately allied to her, and as yet so loosely attached to us, will go also; and then, at least the entire Pacific coast, with the western declivity of the Sierra Nevada would be lost. It would not depend at all on us, nor even on the mere forbearance of California how far eastward the long line across the temperate zone should be drawn which should separate the Republic of the Pacific from the Republic of the Atlantic. Terminus has passed away with all the deities of the ancient Panthenon, but his sceptre remains. Commerce is the God of Boundaries, and no man now living can fortell his ultimate decree.

But it is insisted that the admission of California shall be attended by a Compromise of questions which have arisen out of Slavery. I am opposed to any such Compromise, in any and all the forms in which it has been proposed. First: because while admitting the purity and patriotism of all from whom it is my misfortune to differ, I think all Legislative Compromises essentially and radically wrong and indefensible. They involve the surrender of the exercise of judgment and conscience on distinct and seperate questions at distinct and separate times, with the indispensable advantages it affords for ascertaining truth. They involve a relinquishment of the right to reconsider in Future the decisions of the Present on questions prematurely anticipated, and they are an usurpation, as to future questions of the province of future legislators.

Sir, it seems to me as it Slavery had laid its paralyzing hand upon myself, and the blood were coursing less freely than its wont through my veins when I endeavor to suppose that such a Compromise has been effected, and my utterance forever is arrested upon all the great questions, social, moral and political, arising out of a subject so important and as yet so incomprehensible. What am I to receive in this Compromise? Freedom in California? It is well. It is a noble acquisition. But what am I to give up as an equivalent? A recognition of the claim to perpetuate Slavery in the District of Columbia! Forbearance toward more stringent laws concerning the arrest of persons suspected of being slaves, found in the free States! Forbearance from the Proviso of Freedom, in the charters of new Territories. None of the plans of Compromise offered demand less than two, and most of them insist on all of these conditions. The equivalent then is, some portion of Liberty, some portion of Human Rights in one region, for Liberty in another region. But California brings gold and commerce as well as Freedom. I am then to surrender some portion of Human Freedom in the District of Columbia, and in East California and New Mexico for the mixed consideration of Liberty, Gold and Power on the Pacific Coast!

This view of Legislative Compromises is not new. It has widely prevailed, and many of the State Constitutions interdict the introduction of more than one subject into one bill submitted for legislative action.

Sir, it was of such Compromises that Burke said, in one of the loftiest bursts of even his majestic Parliamentary eloquence:

"Far far from the Commons of Great Britain be all manner of real vice; but ten thousand times further from them, as far as from pole to pole, be the whole tribe of spurious, affected, counterfeit and hypocritical vices. These are the things which are ten thousand times more at war with real virtue—these are the things which are ten thousand times more at war with real duty than any vice known by its name, and distinguished by its proper character.

"Far, far from us be that false and affected Candor, that is eternally in treaty with Crime—that half virtue, which, like the ambiguous animal that plays about in the twilight of a compromise between day and night, is to a just man's eyes an odious and disgusting thing. There is no middle point, my Lords, in which the Commons of Great Britain can meet tyranny and oppression."

But, Sir, could I overcome my repugnance to Compromises in general, I should object to this one on the ground of the inequality and incongruity of the interests to be Compromised. Why, Sir, according to the views I have submitted, California ought to come in and must come in whether Slavery stands or falls in the District of Columbia—whether Slavery stands or falls in New Mexico and Eastern California—and even whether Slavery stands or falls in the slave States. California ought to come in and must come in at all events. It is an independepent question.—What then are these questions arising out of Slavery thus interposed, but collateral questions? They are unnecessary and incongruous, and therefore false issues, not introduced designedly, indeed, to defend that great policy, yet unavoidably tending to that end.

But consent on my part to the Compromise would be disingenuous and fraudulent. It is now avowed by the Hon. Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) that nothing will satisfy the slave States but a Compromise that will convince them that they can remain in the Union consistently with their honor and safety. And what are the concessions which will have that effect. Here they are in the words of that Senator:

"The North must do justice by conceding to the South an equal right in the acquired Territory, and do her duty by causing the stipulations relative to fugitive slaves to be faithfully fulfilled; cease the agitation of the slave question and provide for the insertion of a provision in the Constitution, by an amendment, which will restore to the South, in substance, the power she possessed of protecting herself before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of this Government."

These terms amount to this—that the free States, having already a majority of population, and majorities in both Houses of Congress, shall concede to the slave States, being in a minority in both, the unequal advantage of an equality—that is, that we shall alter the Constitution so as to convert the Government from a National Democracy, controlled by a Constitutional majority of voices into a Federal Alliance, in which the minority shall have a veto against the majority! and thus to return to the original articles of Confederation.

I will not stop to protest against the injustice and inexpediency of an innovation which, if it were practicable, would be so entirely subversive of the principle of Democratic institutions. It is enough to say that it is totally impracticable. The free States, Northern and Western, have acquiesced in the long and nearly unbroken ascendency of the slave States under the Constitution, because the result happened under the Constitution. But they have honor and interests to preserve; and there is nothing in the nature or in the character of the people to induce an expectation that they, loyal as they are, are insensible to the duty of defending them.

But the scheme would still be impracticable, if even this difficulty were overcome. What is proposed is a political equilibrium. Every political equilibrium requires a physical equilibrium to rest upon, and is valueless without it. To constitute a physical equilibrium between the slave States and the free States requires first, an equality of territory or some near approximation, and this is already lost. But it requires much more than this. It requires an equality or a proximate equality in the number of slaves and freemen, and this must be perpetual.

But the census of 1840, gives a slave basis of only two millions and a half, and a free basis of fourteen millions and a half. The population on the slave basis increases in the ratio of 25 per cent. for ten years, while that on the free basis advances at the rate of 38 per cent. The accelerating movement of the free population now complained of, will occupy the new Territories with pioneers, and every day increases the difficulty of forcing or insinuating Slavery into regions which freemen have preoccupied. And if this were possible, the African Slave Trade is prohibited, and the domestic increase is not sufficient to supply the new slave States which are expected to maintain the equilibrium.

The theory of a new political equilibrium claims that it once existed and has been lost. When lost, and how? It began to be lost in 1787, when preliminary arrangements were made to admit five new States in the Northwest Territory, two years before the Constitution was finally adopted:—that is, it began to be lost two years before it began to exist!

Sir: The equilibrium if restored, would be lost more rapidly than it was before. The progress of the free population is to be accelerated by emigration from Europe, Asia, while that of the slaves is to be checked and retarded by inevitable partial emancipation. Nothing, says Montesquieu reduces a man so low as always to see freemen, and yet not be free. Persons in that condition are natural enemies of the State, and their numbers would be dangerous if increased too high! Sir, the fugitive slave Colonies in the free States, in Canada and in Liberia, are the best guarantees South Carolina has for the perpetuity of Slavery.

Nor would success attend any of the details of the Compromise. And first I advert to the amendment of the law concerning fugitives from service or labor. The Constitution contains only a compact which rests for its execution on the States. Not content with this, the slave States induced legislation by Congress; and the Supreme Court of the United States have virtually decided that the whole subject is within the province of Congress, and exclusive of State authority. Nay, they have decided that slaves are to be regarded not merely as persons to be claimed, but as property and chattels to be seized without any legal authority or claim whatever.

The compact is thus subverted by the procurements of the slave States; with what reason, then, can they expect the States *ex gratia* to reassume the obligations from which they caused those States to be discharged? I say, then, to the slave States, you are entitled to no more stringent law, and such a one would be useless. The cause of the insufficiency of the present statute, is not all the leniency of its provisions. It is a law that deprives the alledged refugee from a legal obligation not assumed by him, but imposed upon him by laws enacted before he was born, of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and of any certain judicial process of examination of the claim set up by his pursuer, and finally degrades him into a chattel, which may be seized and carried away peaceably wherever found, even although exercising the rights and responsibilities of a free citizen of the Commonwealth in which he resides, and of the United States; a law which denies to the citizen all the safeguards of personal liberty, to render less possible the escape of the bondman.

We deem its principle therefore unjust, unconstitutional and immoral; and thus, while patriotism withholds its approbation, the consciences of one people condemn it. You will say that these convictions of ours are disloyal. Grant it, for argument's sake; they are nevertheless honest. And the law is to be executed among us, not among you; not *by* us, but by the Federal authority. Has any Government ever succeeded in changing the moral convictions of its subjects by force? But these convictions imply no disloyalty. We revere the Constitution, although we perceive this defect, just as we acknowledge the splendor and the power of the sun, although its surface is tarnished with here and there an opaque spot.

Your Constitution and Law converts hospitality to the refugees from the most degrading oppression on earth into a crime. But all mankind, except you, esteem that hospitality a virtue. The Right of Extradition, of even Fugitives from Justice, is not admitted by the Law of Nature and of Nations, but rests on voluntary compact.

Only two compacts found in Diplomatic History, admitted *extradition of slaves*. Here is one of them. It is found in a Treaty made between Alexander Comnenus, the Greek Emperor at Constantinople, and Oleg II. King of Russia, in the year 902, and is in these words:

"If a Russian Slave take flight from his master, or if he shall be held under pretence of having been bought, his master may pursue him and take him wheresoever he may be found; and whosoever shall prevent his master from taking him, shall be guilty of offending this Treaty, and shall be punished accordingly."

This was in the year of Grace 902, in what is called the Dark Ages, and the contracting powers were Despotism.

And here is the other:

"No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any laws or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such claim or service is due."

This is from the Constitution of the United States in 1787, and the parties were the Republican States of this Union.

The Law of Nations disavows such compacts—the Law of Nations, written on the hearts and consciences of freemen, repudiates them. Armed power could not enforce them, because there is no public conscience to sustain them. I know that there are laws of various sorts that regulate the conduct of men. There are constitutions and statutes, laws mercantile and codes civil; but when we are legislating for States especially, when we are founding States, all these laws must be brought to the standard of the laws of God, and must be tried by that standard, and stand or fall by it. It is of this principle that an eminent political philosopher of England, Burke, said:

"There is but one law for all, namely—that law which governs all law—the law of our Creator—the law of humanity, justice, equity—the law of nature and of nations. So far as any laws fortify this primeval law, and give it more precision, more energy, more effect by their declarations, such laws enter into the Sanctuary and participate in the sacredness of its character But the man who quotes as precedents, the abuses of tyrants and robbers pollutes the very fountains of justice, destroys the foundations of all laws, and therefore removes the only safeguard against evil men, whether Governors or governed, the guard which prevents Governors from becoming Tyrants, and the governed from becoming Rebels."

There was deep philosophy in the confession of an eminent English Judge. When he had condemned a young woman to death under the late sanguinary code of his country, for her first petty theft, she fell dead at his feet. "I seem to myself," said he, "to have been pronouncing sentence not against the prisoner, but against the law itself."

To conclude on this point WE, ARE NOT SLAVE-HOLDERS; we cannot in our judgment be either true Christians or real Freemen, if we impose on another a chain that we deny all human power to fasten on ourselves. You believe and think otherwise, and doubtless with equal sincerity. We judge you not, and He alone who ordained the conscience of man and its laws of action can judge us. Do we then in this conflict demand of you an unreasonable thing in asking that since you will have property that can and will exercise human power to effect its escape, you shall be your own Police, and in acting among us as such, you shall conform to principles indispensible to the security of admitted rights of Freemen!

Another feature in most of the plans of Compromise, is a Bill of Peace for Slavery in the District of Columbia, and this Bill of Peace we cannot grant.—We of the free States are equally with you of the slave States, responsible for the existence of Slavery in this District, the field exclusively of our common legislation. I regret that as yet I see little reason to hope that a majority in favor of Emancipation exists here. The Legislature of New York—from whom, with great defference, I dissent—seems willing to accept now the extinction of the slave trade, and waive Emancipation.

But we shall assume the whole responsibility, if we stipulate not to exercise the power hereafter when a majority shall be obtained. Nor will the plea with which you would furnish us be of any avail. If I could understand myself, I should never be able to explain to the direct understanding of the people whom I represent how it was that an absolute and express power to legislate in all cases over the District of Columbia, was embarrassed and defeated by an implied condition not to legislate for the Abolition of Slavery in that District. Sir, I shall vote for that measure, and am willing to appropriate any means to carry it into execution. And if I shall be asked what I did to embellish the Capital of my country, I will point to her freed men and say, 'these are the monuments of my munificence.' If I was willing to advance a cause that I deem sacred, by disingenuous means, I would advise you to adopt these measures of Compromise which I have thus examined. The echo is not quicker in its response than would be that loud and universal cry of *Repeal!* that would not die away until the *habeas corpus* was secured to the alleged fugitive from bondage, and the symetry of the Free Institutions of the Capital was perfected.

I apply the same observations to the proposition for a waver of the Proviso of Freedom in Territorial charters. Thus far you have only direct popular action in favor of that ordinance, and there seems even to be a partial disposition to await the action of the People of the new Territories, as we have compulsorily waited for it in California. But I must tell you, nevertheless, in all candor and in plainness, that the spirit of the people in the free States is set upon a spring that rises with the pressure put upon it.—That spring, if pressed too hard, will give a recoil that will not leave here one servant who knew his master's will and did it not. You will say that this implies violence. Not at all—it implies only peaceful, lawful, constitutional, customary action. I cannot too strongly express my surprise that those who insist that the people of the slave States cannot be held back from remedies outside of the Constitution, should so far misunderstand us of the free States as to suppose we would not exercise our constitutional rights to sustain the policy which we deem just and beneficient.

I object in the next place to the Compromise of the boundary between Texas and New Mexico.—That is a judicial question in its nature, or at least a question of legal right and title. If it is to be compromised at all, it is due to the two portions, to national dignity as well as to justice that it be kept separate from compromises proceeding on the ground of expediency, and be settled by itself alone.

I take this occasion to say that I do not intend to discuss the question which has been raised by the honorable and distinguished Senator from Mass., (Mr. Webster.) But I am compelled to say that I have not the good fortune to concur with him in the opinions which he has expressed in regard to the admission of new States to be formed out of the State of Texas. There are various questions involved in that subject which I think this is not the time to decide, and which I wish to reserve for future consideration. One is, whether the article of Annexation does really deprive Congress of the right to express its voice in regard to the subdivision of the State of Texas. I only say that to me it seems by no means so plain a question as the Senator assumes, and therefore with me it must remain a question for future consideration—an open question, whether Congress is not a party whose future consent is necessary to any division of Texas.

Mr. Webster—Will the Senator allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. Seward—Certainly, sir.

Mr. Webster—Supposing Congress to have the authority to fix the number of States and the time of election, the appointment of representation, &c., the question is, whether, if new States are formed out of Texas to come into this Union, there is not a solemn pledge by law that they have a right to come in as Slave States.

Mr. Seward—The article is in effect in these words; New States not exceeding four in number may be framed out of the Territory of Texas with the consent of Texas, and shall be admitted into the Union, with or without Slavery if they shall choose.

Mr. Webster—If they "choose" they may come in as slave States.

Mr. Seward—I beg pardon of the Hon. Senator, but it is with or *without* Slavery. But I pass the question as the volume is not at hand, and I fear I shall trespass on the time of the Senate by waiting for it. I am moreover not unconstitutional. I find no authority in the Constitution of the United States for the annexation of foreign States, by resolution. What I mean now especially to insist upon is, that I must have time to deliberate until the occasion actually arrives, before I consent to any division of the State of Texas so as to bring in any new State with a Constitution maintaining Slavery. I must have the point settled that the article of Annexation is compulsory upon me, and also that it is Constitutional.

Mr. Foote—Did I not rightly understand the Senator to say that he would have voted to admit California as a slave State if she had voluntarily inserted such a provision in her Constitution?

Mr. Seward—Yes sir, under these extraordinary circumstances of conquest, of a compact of abandonment, of impossibility to give a Territorial Government, of a Constitution adopted by the people, and of dismemberment of the Empire if she was rejected,—under these circumstances I would have received California though she had come to my profound regret as a slave State. I am happy now Mr. President to understand that I agree with the Hon. Member from Massachusetts, that it is not compulsory upon Congress hereafter to admit four new slave States in Texas—that they have reserved the right to decide whether any new State shall be formed there. I shall vote for admitting no more slave States, unless under circumstances absolutely controlling and compulsory: and such cannot now be foreseen.

Mr. Webster—The Senator does not understand me. My proposition was that States hereafter made out of Texas, with her consent, if they choose to come in as slave States have a right to do so.

Mr. Seward—My position is that they have not a right to come in if Congress shall refuse its consent. It is optional with both parties, Congress and Texas.

Mr. Webster—Does the Senator hold that we may hereafter decide whether they shall be slave States or free States?

Mr. Seward—No, sir; but that Congress may decide that there shall be no States at all formed out of Texas.

Another objection arises out of the principle on which the Compromise rests. That principle is not a classification of the states as Northern and Southern states, as is expressed by the Hon. Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun) but into slaves states and free states as more directly expressed by the honorable Senator from Georgia, (Mr. Berrien.) The argument is, that the states are severally equal, and that these two classes were equal at the first, and that the Constitution was founded on that equilibrium; that the states being equal and the classes of the states being equal in Rights, they are to be regarded as constituting an association in which each state and each of the classes of states respectively contribute in due proportion;—that the new territories are a common acquisition, and that the people of these several states and classes of states have an equal right to participate in them irrespectively:—that the right of the people of the slave states to emigrate to the territories with their slaves as property, is such a participation on their part, inasmuch as the people of the free states emigrate into the same territories with their property. And the argument deduces from this right the principle that if Congress exclude Slavery from any part of the new domain, it would be only just to set off a portion of the domain, (some say south of 36 deg. 30 min., others south of 34 deg.) which should be regarded at least as open to Slavery and to be organized into slave states.

Argument, ingenious and subtle, declamation, earnest and bold, and persuasive, gentle and winning as the voice of the turtle dove when it is heard in the land, all alike and all together have failed to convince me of the soundness of this principle of the proposed Compromise, or of any one of the propositions on which it is attempted to be established. How is the original equality of the states proved? It rests on a syllogism, as follows:

"All men are equal by the Law of Nature and of Nations. But States are only lawful aggregations of individual men, who individually are equal. Therefore States are equal in natural rights."

All this is just and sound. But assuming the same premises, to wit—that all men are equal by the law of Nature and of Nations, the right of property in slaves falls to the ground: for one who is equal to another cannot be the owner or property of that other. But you answer that the Constitution recognizes property in slaves. It would be sufficient then to reply, that this Constitutional recognition must be void, because it is repugnant to the law of Nature and of Nations. But I deny that the Constitution recognizes property in man. I submit, on the other hand, most respectfully, that the Constitution not merely does not affirm that principle, but on the contrary altogether excludes it. The Constitution does not expressly affirm anything on the subject. All that it contains is two incidental allusions to slaves. These are, first, in the provision establishing a ratio of representation and taxation; second, in the provision relating to fugitives from labor. In both cases the Constitution designedly mentions slaves not *as* slaves, much less as chattels, but as persons. That this recognition of them as persons was designed is historically known, and I think never denied. I give only two of the manifold proofs.

John Jay, in the *Federalist*, says:

"Let the case of the Slaves be considered, as it is in truth, a peculiar one. Let the compromising expedient of the Constitution be mutually adopted, which regards them as *inhabitants*, but as debased below the equal level of free inhabitants,—which regards the Slaves as divested of two fifths of the man."

Yes sir! of two-fifths, but of *only* two-fifths, leaving still three-fifths, leaving him still an inhabitant, a living, breathing, moving, reasoning, immortal man.

The other proof is from the debate in the Convention. It is brief and I think instructive.

"Aug. 28, 1787.—Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney moved to require fugitive slaves and servants to be delivered up like convicts.

Mr. Wilson—This would oblige the Executive of the state to do it at public expense.

Mr. Sherman saw no more propriety in the public seizing and surrendering a slave or a servant than a horse.

Mr. Butler withdrew his proposition in order that some particular provision might be made, apart from this article.

Aug. 29th, Mr. Butler moved to insert, after article 15, "If any person bound to service or labor in any of the United States, shall escape into another state, he or she shall not be discharged from such service or labor in consequence of any regulations subsisting in the state to which they escape, but shall be delivered up to persons justly claiming their service or labor."

After the engrossment, Sept. 15, "Article IV. Sec. 2, the 3d paragraph, the term 'legally' was struck out, and the words 'under the laws thereof' inserted after the word, 'State,' in compliance with the wishes of some who thought the term 'legal' equivocal and favoring the idea that Slavery was legal in a moral view."

I deem it established then that the Constitution does not recognize property in man, but leaves that question as between the states to the law of Nature and of Nations. That law as expounded by Vattel is founded in the reason of things. When God had created the earth with its wonderful adaptations, he gave dominion over it to Man—absolute human dominion. The title thus bestowed would have been incomplete if the lord of all terrestrial things could himself have been the property of his fellow man. The right to have a slave implies the right to some one to make the slave. That right must be equal and mutual; and that would resolve society into a state of perpetual war. But if we grant the original equality of the states and grant also the constitutional recognition of slaves as property, still the argument we are considering fails, because the states were not parties to the Constitution as states. It is the Constitution of the People of the United States. But even if the States continued as states, they surrendered their equality as states, and submitted themselves to the sway of the numerical majority, with qualifications or checks; first, of the representation of three-fifths of slaves in the ratio of representation and taxation: and, secondly, of the equal representation of states in the Senate.

The proposition of an established classification of states as slave states and free states as asserted by some, and into Northern and Southern as asserted by others, seems to me purely imaginary, and of course the supposed equilibrium of those classes a mere conceit. This must be so; because when the Constitution was adopted twelve of the thirteen states were slave states, and so there was no equilibrium. And so as to the classification of states as Northern states and Southern States. It is the maintenance of Slavery by law, in a state, not parallels of latitude that makes it a Southern state, and the abscence of this that makes it a Northern state. And so, all the states, save one, were Southern states, and there was no equilibrium. But the Constitution

was made not only for Southern and Northern states, but for states neither one nor the other, but Western states. Their coming in was foreseen and provided for.

It needs little argument to show that the idea of a joint stock association or a copartnership as applicable even by its analogies to the United States is erroneous, with all the consequences fancifully deduced from it. The United States are a political State or organized society, whose end is government for the security, welfare and happiness of all who live under its protection. The theory I am combatting reduces the objects of Government to the mere spoils of conquest. On the contrary of a theory so debasing, the preamble of the Constitution not only asserts the sovereignty to be not in States but in the People, but also promulgates the objects of the Constitution.

"We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of Liberty, do ordain and establish this Constitution."

Objects sublime and benevolent! They exclude the very idea of conquests to be either divided among States or even enjoyed by them for the purpose of securing, not the blessings of liberty, but the evils of Slavery.

There is a novelty in the principle of this Compromise, which condemns it. Simultaneously with the establishment of the Constitution, Virginia ceded her domain, which then extended to the Mississippi, and was even claimed to extend to the Pacific. Congress accepted it and unanimously devoted the domain to Freedom, in the language from which the Ordinance now so severely condemned, was borrowed. Five States have already been organized on this domain, from all of which in pursuance of that Ordinance, Slavery is excluded. How did it happen that this theory of the equality of the States, of the classification of States, of the equilibrium of the States, of the title of the States to common enjoyment of the domain, or to an equitable and just partition between them was never promulgated, nor even dreamed of by the slave States, who unanimously consented to this Ordinance?

There is another aspect of the principle of Compromise which deserves consideration. It assumes that Slavery, if not the only institution, is, in a slave State, at least the ruling institution, and that this characteristic was recognized by the Constitution.—But Slavery is only *one* of many institutions there. Freedom is equally an institution there. Slavery is only a temporary, accidental, partial, incongruous one. Freedom, on the contrary, is a perpetual, organic, universal one, in harmony with the Constitution of the United States. The slaveholder himself stands under the protection of the latter, in common with all the free citizens of the State.

But the principle of this Compromise gives complete ascendency in the slave States, and in the Constitution of the United States, to the subordinate, accidental and incongrous institution over its antagonist. To reduce this claim for Slavery to an absurdity, it is only necessary to add that there are only two States in which slaves are a majority, and not one in which the slaveholders are not a very disproportinate minority.

But there is yet another aspect in which this principle must be examined. It regards the domain only as a possession to be enjoyed either in common or by partition by the citizens of the old States. It is true indeed that the national domain is ours; true that it was acquired by the prowess and wealth of the whole country; but we hold, nevertheless, no arbitrary power over it. We hold no arbitrary authority over anything, whether acquired lawfully or by usurpation. The Constitution regulates our stewardship. The Constitution devotes the domain to union, to justice, to defence, to welfare and liberty. But there is a higher law than the Constitution which regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes. The territory is a part—no inconsiderable part—of the common heritage of mankind, bestowed upon them by the Creator of the Universe. We are his stewards, and must so discharge our trust as to secure in the highest attainable degree their happiness. How momentous that trust is, we may learn from the institutions of the founder of modern philosophy.

"No man can, by care-taking," as the Scriptures saith, "add a whit to his stature in this little model of man's body: but in the great frame of Kingdoms and Commonwealths, it is in the power of Princes or estates to add amplitude and greatness to their Kingdoms; for by introducing such ordinances, constitutions and customs as are wise, they may sow greatness to their posterity and successors.—But these things are commonly not observed, but left to take their chance."

We are an Estate, and are deliberating for the Commonwealth just as our fathers deliberated in establishing the institutions we enjoy. Whatever superiority there is in our condition and hopes over those of any other "Kingdom" or "Estate" is due to the fortunate circumstance that our ancestors did not leave things to take their chance, but that they added amplitude and greatnees to our commonwealth, by introducing such ordinances, constitutions and customs as were wise.

We, in our time, have succeeded to the same responsibilities, and we cannot approach the duty before us, wisely or justly, except we raise ourselves to the great consideration of how we can most certainly sow greatness to our posterity and successors. And now the simple, bold, and awful question, which presents itself to us, is this: Shall we who are founding institutions, social and political, for countless millions—shall we who know by experience the wise and the just, and are free to choose them, and to reject the erroneous and the unjust—shall we establish human bondage, or permit it by our sufferance to be established? Sir, our fathers would not have hesitated an hour. They found Slavery existing here, and they left it only because they could not remove it. There is not only no free State which would now establish it, but there is no slave State which, if it had but the free alternative, as we now have, would have founded Slavery. Indeed our revolutionary predecessors had precisely the same question before them in establishing an organic law under which the States of Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa have since come into the Union; and they solemnly repudiated and excluded Slavery from those States forever. I confess that the most alarming evidence of our degeneracy which has yet been given is found in the fact that we even debate such a question.

Sir, there is no Christian nation that, free to choose as we are, would establish Slavery. I speak on due consideration, because Britain, France and Mexico have abolished Slavery, and all other European States are preparing to abolish it as rapidly as they can.

We cannot establish Slavery, because there are certain elements of the security, welfare and greatness of nations, which we all admit, or ought to admit and require, as essential; and these are—the security of natural right, the diffusion of knowledge, and the freedom of industry. Slavery is incompatible with all of these; and just in proportion to the extent that it prevails and controls in any Republican State, just to that extent it subverts the principle of Democracy, and converts the State into an Aristocracy or Despotism. I will not offend sensibilities by drawing my proof from the slave States existing among ourselves, but I will draw them from the greatest of the European slave States. The population of Russia in Europe, in 1844, was 54,251,000. Of these were serfs 53,500,000 the residue, nobles, clergy, merchants, &c., 751,000. The Imperial Government abandons the control over the fifty-three and a half millions to their owners, and the residue, included in the 751,000, are thus a privileged clan or aristocracy. If ever the Government interferes at all with the serf, who are the only laboring population, it is by edicts, designed to abridge the opportunities of education, and thus continue their debasement. What was the origin of this system? Conquest; in which the captivity of the conquered was made perpetual and hereditary.

This, it seems to me, is identical with American Slavery, only at one and the same time, exaggerated by the greater disproportion between the privileged classes and the slaves in their respective numbers, and yet relieved of the unhappiest feature of American Slavery—the distinction of castes. What but this renders Russia at once the most arbitrary Despotism, and the most barberous State in Europe? And what is its effect but industry comparatively profitless, and sedition not occasional and partial, but chronic and pervading the empire. With Massachusetts and Ohio among us, shall we pass by their free and beneficent examples, and select our institutions from the dominions of the Czar?

I cannot stop to debate long with those who maintain that Slavery is in itself practically economical and humane. I might be content with saying that there are some axioms in political science that a statesman or a founder of States may adopt, especially in the Congress of the United States, and that among these axioms are these:

That all men are created equal and have inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the choice of pursuits of happiness;

That knowledge promotes virtue, and righteousness exalteth a nation;

That Freedom is preferable to Slavery, and that, democratic governments when they can be maintained by acquiescence without force, are preferable to institutions exercising arbitrary and irresponsible power.

It remains only to say, on this part of the subject, that Slavery being incongruous and repugnant, is dangerous to the safety of the State. The conservative principle of the State is the security of the voluntary acquiescence of the people. That acquiescence is obtained by universal suffrage, which demands, of course, equality of knowledge and property, as far as that is practically attainable without injustice or oppression. This argument is sustained by our own experience. There is no danger menacing the Union, there never has been any that would have menaced it, had Slavery had no shelter beneath its protection. If Slavery, confined as it now is, threatens the invasion of the Constitution, how can we enlarge its boundaries and increase its influence without increasing the danger already existing?

Whether, then, I regard merely the welfare of the future inhabitants of the new territories, or the United States or the welfare of the whole family of mankind, I cannot consent to introduce Slavery into any part of this continent which is now exempt from what seems to me to be so great an evil.

These are my reasons for declining to compromise the questions relating to Slavery as a condition of the admission of California.

In acting upon an occasion so grave as this, a respectful consideration is due to the arguments founded on extraneous considerations, of senators who counsel a course different from that which I have preferred.

The first of these arguments is that Congress has no power to legislate on the subject of Slavery within the Territories. Sir, Congress has power to admit new States; and since Congress may admit, it follows that Congress may reject new States. The discretion of Congress in admitting is absolute, except that when admitted the State must be a Republican State, and must be a *State*—that is, it shall have the constitutional powers of a State. But the greater includes the less; we may impose conditions not inconsistent with those fundamental power. Boundaries are such; the reservation of the public domain is such; the right to divide is such; the ordinance excluding Slavery is such a condition. the organization of Territory is auxiliary or preliminary. It is the inchoate, initiative act of admission, and is performed under the clause granting the power necessary to execute the express powers of the Constitution. This power comes from the treaty making power also, and I think it is well traced to have the power to make needful rules and regulations concerning the public domain. But the power is here to be exercised, however derived; and the right to regulate property, to administer justice in regard to property is assumed in every Territorial charter. If we have power to legislate concerning personal rights. Freedom *is* a personal right. The Constitution does not sanction property in man, and Congress being the supreme legislature, has the same right in regard to property and rights in Territories that the States would have if organized.

It is insisted further that the inhibition is unnecessary.

And here I have to regret the loss of able and distinguished senators who go with us for the admission of California. Especially do I regret the separation from us of the able and distinguished senator from Missouri (Mr. Benton.) When that senator announced that he should not sustain the Proviso of Freedom, I was induced to exclaim

Cur in theatram, Cato severe venisti,
An ideo tantum veneras ut exires.

But that distinguished senator is crowning a life of eminent public service by bringing the first state of the Pacific into the Union, and grateful to him for that, I freely leave to him to determine for himself what weight he will give to the cause of human freedom in his action on so grave an occasion.

The argument is that the Proviso is unnecessary. I answer, then there can be no error in insisting upon it. But why is it unnecessary? It is said, first by reason of the climate. If this be so, why do not the representatives of the slave States yield the Proviso? They deny that climate prevents the introduction of Slavery. Now, I will leave nothing to contingency. But in truth, I think the argument is against the proposition. Is there any climate where Slavery has not existed? It has prevailed all over Europe, from sunny Italy to bleak England, and is existing now, stronger than in any other land, in ice-bound Russia.

But it will be replied that this is not African Slavery. I rejoin, that only makes the case the stronger. If this vigorous Saxon race of ours was reduced to Slavery while it retained the courage of semi-barbarism, in its own high Northern latitude, what security does climate afford against the transplantation of the more gentle, more docile, and already enslaved and debased African, to the gentle clime of New Mexico and California? Sir, there is no climate uncongenial to Slavery. It is true it is less productive than free labor in many Northern countries; but so it is less productive than free white labor in even tropical climates. Labor is in quick demand in all new countries. Slave labor is cheaper than free labor and will go first into new regions; and wherever it goes it brings labor into dishonor, and therefore free white labor avoids competition with it. Sir, I might rely on climate, if I had not been born in a land where Slavery existed, and that land was all north of the 40th parallel of latitude, and if I did not know the struggle that it has cost and which is yet going on, to get complete relief from the institution and its baleful consequences.

But sir, it is said that Slavery is prevented by the laws of God from entering into the Territory from which we propose to inhibit it. I will look into that matter a little more closely. I wish then, with the utmost respect to ask senators whether the Ordinance of 1787 was necessary or not? That Ordinance has been the subject of too many eulogiums to be now pronounced a vague and idle thing. That ordinance carried the prohibition of Slavery quite up to the 49th deg. of north lat. and yet we are now told that we can trust the laws of God without any ordinance to exclude Slavery as far down as 36 deg. 30 min. Unfortunately too, the Ordinance of 1787 began on the 37th parallel of North latitude, so that there is no part of the Territory which it covered, in which Slavery, according to the present theory was not excluded by the law of God. I know no better authority as to the laws of God on this subject than one from whom I have already had occasion to quote with some freedom. And it is the opinion of Montesquieu that it is only the indolence of mankind and not the climate which causes the introduction of Slavery, anywhere. There is no climate where Slavery is necessary; there is none where it cannot be established, if the customs and laws permit.

I shall dwell only very briefly on the argument derived from the Mexican laws. The proposition that those laws must remain in force until altered by laws of our own is satisfactory, and so is the proposition that those Mexican laws abolished and continue to prohibit Slavery; and still I deem an enactment by ourselves wise and even necessary.

Both of the propositions I have stated are denied with just as much confidence by southern statesmen and jurists as they are affirmed by those of the free States. The population of the new territories is rapidly becoming an American one to whom the Mexican code will seem a foreign one entitled to little deference or obedience. Slavery has never obtained anywhere by express legislative authority, but always by trampling down laws higher than any mere municipal laws—the law of nature and of nations. There can be no oppression in superadding the sanction of Congress to the authority which is so weak and so vehemently questioned. And there is some possibility, if not a probability, that the institution might obtain a foothold surreptitiously, if it should not be absolutely forbidden by our own authority.

What is insisted upon, therefore, is not a mere abstraction or a mere sentiment as is contended by those who concur with us as to admitting California, but would waive the Proviso. And what is conclusive on the subject is that it is conceded on all hands that the effect of insisting on it prevents the extension of Slavery into the region to which it is proposed to apply it. Again, it is insisted that the diffusion of Slavery does not increase its evils. The argument seems to me merely specious and quite unsound.

And this brings me to the great and all-absorbing argument that the Union is in danger of being dissolved, and that it can only be saved by Compromise.

I do not overlook the fact that the entire delegation from the slave States, although they differ in the details of compromise proposed, and perhaps also upon the exact circumstances of the crisis, seem to concur in the momentous warning. Nor do I doubt at all the patriotic devotion to the Union which is expressed by those from whom this warning proceeds. And yet, sir, although these warnings have been uttered with impassioned solemnity in my hearing, every day for near three months, my confidence in the Union remains unshaken. I think they are to be received with no inconsiderable distrust, because they are uttered under the influence of a controlling interest to be secured, a paramount object to be gained,—and that is, an equilibrium of power in the Republic. I think they are to be received with even more distrust, because with the most profound respect they are uttered under an obviously high excitement; nor is that excitement an unnatural one. It is a law of our nature, that the passions disturb the reason and judgment just in proportion to the importance of the occasion and the consequent necessity for calmness and candor. I think they are to be distrusted, because there is a diversity of opinion in regard to the nature and operation of this excitement. The senators from some States say that it has brought all parties in that region into unanimity. The senator from Kentucky says that the danger lies in the violence of party spirit, and refers us to the difficultics which attended the organization of the House of Representatives.

Sir, in my humble judgment, it is not the fierce conflict of Parties that we are seeing and hearing; but, on the contrary, it is the agony of distracted parties; a convulsion resulting from the too narrow foundation of both and of all parties—foundations laid in compromises of natural justice and of human liberty. A question—a moral question—transcending the too narrow creeds of parties has arisen. The public conscience expands with it, and the green withes of party associations give way and break and fall off from it. No. sir, it is not the State that is dying of the fever of party spirit. It is merely a paralysis of parties, premonitory of their restoration with the new elements of health and vigor imbibed from that spirit of the age which is so justly called Progress.

Nor is the evil that of unlicensed, irregular, and turbulent faction. We are told that twenty legislatures are in session burning like furnaces, heating and inflaming the popular passions. But those twenty legislatures are Constitutional furnaces. They are performing their customary functions, imparting healthful heat and vitality, while within their Constitutional jurisdiction. If they rage beyond its limits, the popular passions of this country are not at all, I think, in danger of being inflamed to excess. No, sir, let none of those fires be extinguished. Forever let them burn and blaze. They are neither ominous meteors nor baleful comets, but planets, and bright and intense as their heat may be, it is their native temperature, and they must still obey the law which by attraction toward the centre holds them in their spheres.

I see nothing of that conflict between the southern and the northern States, or between their Representative bodies, which seems to be on all sides of me assumed. Not a word of menace—not a word of anger, not an intemperate word has been uttered in any Northern Legislatures. They firmly but calmly assert their convictions, but at the same time they assert their unqualified purpose to submit to the common arbiter, and for weal or for wo abide the fortunes of the Union.

What if there be less of moderation in the Legislatures of the South. It only indicates on which side the balance is inclining, and that the decision of the Government is near at hand. I argue with those who say that there can be no peaceful dissolution—no dissolution of the Union by the secession of States, but that disunion, dissolution, happen when it may, will and must be Revolution. I discover no omens of Revolution. The predictions of the political astrologers do not argue as to time, or manner in which it is to occur. According to the authority of the Hon. senator from Alabama, (Mr. Clemens,) the event has already happened, and the Union is now in ruins. According to the horoscope of the Hon. senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Foote,) it was to take place on a day already past. According to the Hon. and distinguished senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) it is not to be immediate, but to be developed by time.

[Mr. Foote here interposed and disowned the construction which had been put upon his remarks, and made further explanations.]

Mr. Seward.—I am very happy to have given the Senator an opportunity to correct the erroneous impression which the remark which I have referred to had made.—Now the Hon. Senator will do me the justice to allow that I am at liberty to subtract one prediction from the political Almanac, and so the predictions lose so much of importance.

I see no omens of Revolution. What are the omens to which our attention is directed? I see nothing but a broad difference of opinion here, and the excitement consequent upon it.

I have observed that Revolutions which begin in the Palace, seldom go beyond the Palace Walls, and these effect only the dynasty which reigns there. This Revolution, if I understand it, began here in the Senate a year ago, when the Representatives from Southern States assembled here and addressed their constituents on what was called the aggression of the Northern States. No revolution was designed at that time, and all that has happened since, is the return to Congress of Legislative Resolutions which seem to me to be conventional responses to the address which emanated from the Capital.

Sir, in any condition of society, there can be no revolution without a cause—an adequate cause. What cause exists here? We are admitting a new State, but there is nothing new in that—we have already admitted seventeen before. But it is said that the slave States are in danger of losing political power by the admission of the new State. Well, Sir is there anything new in that? The slave States have always been losing political power, and they always will be while they have any to lose. At first, twelve of the thirteen States were slave States. Now only fifteen of the thirty are slave States. Moreover, the change is constitutionally made, and the Government was constructed so as to permit changes of the balance of power, in obedience to changes of the forces of the body politic. Danton used to say: "It's all well while the People cry Danton and Robespierre, but woe for me if ever the People learn to say, Robespierre and Danton!" That is all of it, sir. The People have been accustomed to say, the South and the North—they are beginning now to say, the North and the South.

Sir, those who would alarm us with the terrors of Revolution have not well considered the structure of this Government, and the organization of its forces. It is a Democracy of property and persons, with a fair approximation toward Universal Education, and operating by means of Universal Suffrage. The constituent members of this Democracy are the only persons who could subvert; and they are not the citizens of a metropolis like Paris, or of a region subjected to the influences of a metropolis like France, but they are husbandmen dispersed over this broad land, on the mountain, and on the plain, and on the prairie, from the Ocean to the Rocky Mountains, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. And this people are now, while we are discussing their imaginary danger, at peace in their happy homes, and as unconcerned and even misinformed of their peril as they are of events occurring in the moon. Nor have the alarmists made due allowance in their calculations for the influence of conservative, reaction—strong in any Government, and irresistible in a rural Republic operating by universal suffrage. That principle of reaction is due to the force of the habits of acquiescence and loyalty among the people. No man better understood the principle than Machiavelli, who told us in regard to factions that "no safe reliance can be placed in the force of Nature and the bravery of words except it be corroborated by custom." Do the alarmists remember that this Government has stood sixty years already without exacting one drop of blood—that this Government has stood sixty years, and Treason is an obsolete crime? That day I trust is far off when the fountains of popular contentment shall be broken up—but whenever it shall come it will bring forth a higher illustration than has ever yet been given of the excellence of the Democratic system. For then it will be seen how calmly, how firmly, how nobly a great people can act in preserving their Constitution when "Love of Country moveth, Example teacheth, Company comforteth, Emulation quickeneth, and Glory exalteth."

When the founders of the New Republic of the South come to draw over the fame of this Empire along or between its parallels of latitude or longitude, their ominous lines of dismemberment, soon to be broadly and deeply shaded with fraternal blood, they may come to the discovery then, if not before, that the national and even the political connections of the region embraced forbid such a partition; that its possible divisions are not Northern and Southern at all, but Eastern and Western, Atlantic and Pacific, and that Nature and Commerce have allied indissolubly for weal and woe the seceders and those from whom they are to be separated: that while they would rush into a civil war to restore an imaginary equilibrium between the Northern States and the Southern States, that a new equilibrium had taken its place, in which all those States are on the one side and the boundless West was on the other.

Sir, when the founders of the new Republic of the South come to trace those fearful lines, they will indicate what portions of the continent are to be broken off from their connection with the Atlantic through the St. Lawrence, the Hudson, the Delaware, the Potomac and the Mississippi—what portion of this people are to be denied the use of the lakes, the railroads and the canals, now constituting common and customary avenues of travel, trade and social intercourse—what families and kindred are to be separated, and converted into enemies, and what States are to be the scenes of perpetual border warfare, aggravated by interminable horrors of interminable insurrection? When those portentous lines shall be drawn they will disclose what portion of this people is to retain the Army and Navy, and the flag of so many victories. And, on the other hand, what portion of this people is to be subjected to new and ruinous imposts, direct taxes, and forced loans and conscriptions, to maintain an opposing army and opposing navy and the new and hateful banner of sedition. Then the projectors of the new Republic of the South will meet the question—and they may well pepare now to answer it—"What is all this for?—what intolerable wrong?—what unfraternal injustice have rendered these calamities unavoidable?—what gain will this unnatural revolution be to us?" The answer will be—"All this is done to secure the Institution of African Slavery."

And then, if not before, the question will be discussed. What is this institution of Slavery that it should cause these unparalled sacrifices and these disastrous afflictions? And this will be the answer: When the Spaniards, few in number, discovered the Western Indies and the adjacent Continental America, they needed labor to draw forth from its virgin stores some speedy return to the cupidity of the Court and Bankers of Madrid, they enslaved the indolent, inoffensive and confiding natives who perished by thousands and even by millions under that new and unnatural bondage. A humane ecclesiastic advised the substitution of Africans reduced to captivity in their native wars, and a pious Princess adopted the suggestion with a dispensation from the Head of the Church, granted on the ground of the prescriptive right of the Christian to enslave the heathen to effect his conversion. The Colonists of North America, innocent in their unconsciousness of wrong, encouraged the Slave Trade, and thus the labor of subduing their territory devolved chiefly upon the African race. A happy conjunction brought on an awakening of the conscience of mankind to the injustice of Slavery simultaneously with the independence of the Colonies. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania welcomed and embraced the spur of universal emancipation; renouncing luxury they secured influence and empire. But the States of the South, misled by a new and profitable cultivation, elected to maintain and perpetuate Slavery, and thus chose luxury they lost power and empire.

When this answer shall be given it will appear that the question of dissolving the Union is a complex question,—that it embraces the fearful issue whether the Union shall stand, and Slavery, under the steady, peaceful action of moral, social and political causes be removed by gradual voluntary effort and compensation, or whether the Union shall be dissolved, and civil wars ensue, bringing on violent but complete and immediate emancipation. We are now arrived at that stage of our national progress when that crisis can be foreseen, when we must foresee it. It is directly before us. Its shadow is upon us. It darkens the legislative halls, the temples of worship, and the home and the hearth. Every question political, civil or ecclesiastical, however foreign to the subject, Slavery brings up Slavery, is an incident, and the incident supplants the principal question. We hear of nothing but Slavery, and we can talk of nothing but Slavery. And now it seems to me that all our difficulties, embarrassments and dangers arise not out of unlawful perversions of the question of Slavery as some suppose, but out of the want of moral courage to meet this question of emancipation as we ought. Consequently we hear on one side, demands, absurd indeed but yet unceasing, for an immediate and unconditional Abolition of Slavery, as if any power except the people of the slave States could abolish it, and as if they could be moved to abolish it by merely sounding the trumpet violently and proclaiming emancipation, while the institution was interwoven with all their social and political interests, constitutions and customs.

On the other hand our statesmen say that Slavery has always existed, and for aught they know or can do, it always must exist. God permitting it, and He only can indicate the way to remove it, as if the Supreme Creator, after giving us the instructions of his Providence and Revelation for the illumination of our minds and consciences did not leave us in all human transactions with due invocations of his Holy Spirit to seek out his will, and execute it for ourselves.

Here then is the point of my separation from both of these parties. I feel assured that Slavery will give way, and must give way to the salutary instructions of economy, and the ripening influences of humanity,—that emancipation is inevitable, and is near,—that it may be hastened or hindered, and that whether it be peaceful or violent depends upon the Government, whether it be hastened or hindered,—that all measures which justify Slavery or extend it, tend to the consummation of violence;—all that check its extension and abate its strength, tend to its peaceful extirpation. But I will adopt now none but lawful, Constitutional and peaceful means to secure even that end; and none such can I or will I forego.

Nor do I know any important or responsible body that proposes to do more than this. No free State claims to extend its legislation into a slave State. None claims that Congress shall usurp power to abolish Slavery in the slave States. None claims that any violent, unconstitutional or unlawful measures shall be resorted to. And on the other hand, if we offer no scheme or plan for the adoption of the slave States, with the assent and co-operation of Congress, it is only because the slave States are unwilling as yet to receive such suggestions, or even to entertain the question of emancipation in any State.

But, sir, I will take this occasion to say, that while I cannot agree with the Hon. Senator from Massachusetts in proposing to devote $80,000,000 to remove the free colored population from the slaves, and thus, as it appears to me, fortify Slavery—there is no reasonable limit to which I am not willing to go in applying the national treasures to effect the peaceful voluntary removal of Slavery itself.

I have thus endeavored to show that there is not now, and is not likely to occur, any adequate cause for revolution in regard to Slavery. But you reply that nevertheless, you must have guarantees. And the first one is for the surrender of fugitives from labor. That guarantee you cannot have, as I have already shown, because you cannot roll back the tide of social progress. You must be content with what you have. If you wage war against us, you can, at most, only conquer us, and then all you can get will be a treaty, and that you have already. But you insist on a guarantee against the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia or war. Well, when you shall have declared war against us, what shall hinder us from decreeing that Slavery shall cease within the National Capital?

You say that you will not submit to the exclusion of slaves from the new Territories. What will you gain by resistance? Liberty follows the sword although her sway is one of peace and beneficence. Can you propogate Slavery then by the sword?

You insist that you cannot submit to the freedom with which Slavery is discussed in the free States. Will war—a war for Slavery—crush or even moderate that discussion? No sir; that discussion will not cease.

War would only inflame it to a greater height. It is a part of the eternal conflict between truth and error, between mind and physical force, the conflict of man against the obstacles which oppose his way to an ultimate and glorious destiny. It will go on until you shall terminate it in the only way in which any State or nation has terminated it, by yielding to it—yielding in your own time and in your own manner, indeed, but nevertheless yielding to the progress of emancipation.

You will do this sooner or later, whatever may be your opinions now; because nations which were prudent and humane and wise as you are, have done so already.

No, sir, there is no reason to fear that this inevitable change will go too far or too fast for their safety or welfare. It cannot well go too fast or too far, if the only alternatye of it is a war of races.

But it cannot go too fast. Slavery has a reliable and accommodating ally in a party in the Free States which, though it claims to be and doubtless is, in many respects, a party of progress, finds its sole security for its political power in the support and aid of Slavery in the slave States. Of course I do not include in that party those who are now co-operating in maintaining the cause of Freedom against Slavery. I am not of this party of progress in the North which lends its support to Slavery. But it is only just and candid that I should be a witness to their fidelity to the interests of Slavery. Slavery has, moreover, a more natural alliance with the Aristocracy of the North and with the Aristocracy of Europe.

So long as Slavery shall possess the cotton fields, the sugar fields, and the rice fields of the world, so long will commerce and capital yield its toleration and sympathy. Emancipation is a Democratic Revolution. It is Capital that arrests all Democratic Revolutions. It was Capital that in a single year rolled back the tide of revolution on the base of the Carpathian mountains, across the Danube and the Rhine, into the streets of Paris. It is Capital that is rapidly rolling back the throne of Napoleon into the Chambers of the Tuileries.

Slavery has a guarantee still stronger than these in the prejudices of caste and color, which induce even large majorities in all the Free States to regard sympathy with the slave as an act of unmanly humiliation and self-abasement.

Although philosophy meekly expresses her distrust of the white race, and confidently denies that such a superiority, if justly claimed, could give a title to oppression, there remains one more guarantee—one that has seldom failed you, and will seldom fail you hereafter. New States cling in closer alliance than the other ones to the federal power. The concentrating of the slave power enables you for long periods to control the Federal Government, with the aid of the New States. I do not know the sentiments of the Representatives of California; but my word for it, if they should be admitted on this floor to-day against your most obstinate opposition, they would, on all questions really affecting your interests, be found at your side. With these allies and aids to break the force of Emancipation, there will be no disunion and no secession. I do not say that there may not be disturbance, though I do not apprehend even that. Absolute regularity and order in administration have not yet been established in any Government, and unbroken popular tranquility has not yet been attained in even the most advanced condition of human society. The machinery of our system is necessarily complex. A pivot may fall out here—a lever may be displaced there—but the machinery will soon recover its regularity and move on just as before, with even better adaptation and adjustment to overcome new obstructions.

There are many well-disposed persons who are alarmed at the occurrence of any such disturbance.

The failure of a legislative body to organize is to their apprehension a fearful omen, and an extra Constitutional assemblage to consult upon public affairs is with them cause for desperation. Even Senators speak of the Union as if it existed only by consent, and, as it seems to be implied, by the assent of the Legislatures of the States. On the contrary, the Union was not founded in voluntary choice, nor does it exist by voluntary consent.

A Union was proposed to the Colonies by Franklin and others in 1754; but such was their aversion to an abridgment of their own importance respectively, that it was rejected even under the pressure of a disastrous invasion by France.

A union of choice was proposed to the Colonies in 1775; but so strong was their opposition that they went through the War of Independence without having established more than a mere Council of Confederation.

But with Independence came enlarged interests of agriculture, absolutely new interests of commerce, of fisheries, of navigation, of a common domain, common debts, of common revenue and taxation, of the administration of justice, of public defence, of public honor, in short, interests of common nationality and sovereignty; interests which at last compelled the adoption of a more perfect union—a National Government.

The genius, talent and learning of Hamilton, of Jay, of Madison, surpassing, perhaps, the intellectual power ever excited before for the establishment of a Government, combined with the serene but mighty influence of Washington, were only sufficient to secure the reluctant adoption of the Constitution that is now the object of all our affections and of the hopes of mankind. No wonder that the conflicts in which that Constitution was born, and the almost despairing solemnity of Washington in his Farewell Address, impressed his countrymen and mankind with a profound distrust of its perpetuity! No wonder that while the murmurs of that day are yet ringing in our ears, we have cherished that distrust with pious reverence as a national and patriotic sentiment.

But it is time to prevent abuses of that sentiment. It is time to shake off that fear, for fear is always weakness. It is time to remember that Government even when it arises by chance or accident, and is administered capriciously and oppressively, is ever the strongest of all human institutions, surviving many social and ecclesiastical changes and convulsions, and that this Government of ours has all the inherent strength, common to Governments, and added to them is the solidity and firmness derived from broader and deeper foundations in natural justice, and from a better civil adaptation to promote the welfare and happiness of mankind.

The Union, the creation of necessities physical, moral, social and political, endures by virtue of the same necessities, and these necessities are stronger than when it was produced, and by the greater amplitude of territory now covered by it;—stronger by the six-fold increase of the society living under its beneficent protection;—stronger by the argumentation ten thousand times of the field, the anvil, in their constant circle of internal and international exchanges;—stronger in the long rivers penetrating regions before unknown;—stronger in all the artificial roads, canals and other channels and avenues essential not only to trade but to defence;—stronger in steam navigation, in steam locomotion on the land, and in telegraph communications unknown when the Constitution was adopted;—stronger in the freedom and in the growing Empire of the seas;—stronger in the element of national honor in all lands, and stronger than all in the now settled habits of veneration and affection for institutions so stupendous and useful.

The Union then IS, not because merely that men choose that it shall be, but because some Government must exist here, and no other Government than this can. If it should be dashed to atoms by the whirlwind, the lightning or the earthquake to day, it would rise again in all its just and magnificent proportions to-morrow.

I have heard somewhere here, and almost for the first time in my life, of divided allegiance—of allegiance to the South and to the Union—of allegiance to States severally, and to the Union. Sir, if sympathies with State emulation and pride of achievement could be allowed to raise up another sovereign to divide the allegiance of a citizen of the United States, I might recognize the claim of the State to which by birth and gratitude I belong—to the State of Hamilton and Jay, of Schuyler, of the Clintons and of Fulton—the State which, with less than 200 miles of natural navigation connected with the ocean, has, by her own enterprise, secured to herself the commerce of the Continent and is steadily advancing to the command of the commerce of the world. But for all this, I know only one Country and one Sovereign—the United States of America and the American People.

And such as my allegiance is, is the loyalty of every other citizen of the United States.

As I speak he will speak when his time arrives; he knows no other country and no other sovereign; he has life, liberty, property, and precious affections, and hopes for himself and for his posterity, treasured up in the ark of the Union; he knows as well and feels as strongly as I do, that this Government is his own Government; that he is a part of it; that it was established for him, and that it is maintained by him; that it is the only truly wise, just, free, and equal Government that has ever existed; that no other Government could be so wise, just, free and equal; that it is safer and more beneficent than any which time or change could bring into its place.

You may tell me, Sir, that although all this may be true, yet that the trial of faction has not yet been made, Sir, if the trial of faction has not been made, it has not been because that faction has not always existed, and has not always menaced a trial, but because faction could find no fulcrum on which to place the lever to subvert the Union, as it can find no fulcrum now, and in this is my confidence. I would not, rashly provoke the trial but I will not suffer a fear which I have not to make me Compromise one sentiment, one principle of truth or justice, to avert a danger that all experience teaches me is purely chimerical. Let those then who distrust the Union make Compromises to save it. I shall not impeach their wisdom, as I certainly cannot their patriotism, but indulging no such apprehensions myself I shall vote for the admission of California, directly, without conditions, without qualification, and without Compromise. For the vindication of that vote I look not to the verdict of the passing hour, disturbed as the public mind now is by conflicting interests and passions, but to that period, happily not far distant, when the vast regions over which we are now legislating, shall have received their destined inhabitants.

While looking forward to that day, its countless generations seem to be raising up and passing in dim and shadowy review before us. And the voice comes forth from their reviewed ranks, saying. "Waste your treasures, and your armies, if you will, raze your fortifications to the ground, sink your navies into the sea, transmit to us even a dishonored name, if you must, but the soil that you hold in trust for us, give it to us free; you found it free and conquered it to extend a better and surer freedom over it—Whatever choice you have made for yourselves, let us have no partial freedom, let us all be free let the reversion of our broad domain descend to us unincumbered and free from the calamities and the sorrows of human bondage."

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1850.

Mr. Webster's Speech.

If there were a Pepys now living in Boston and snapping up for his diary all those unconsidered trifles of street and personal news, which do not get into print, but which nevertheless make History, he would record a great many facts that would give clues to the investigations of the future annalist. He would note down that Mr. Winthrop received the cue for his extraordinary speech from a private meeting called together by certain gentlemen to concoct a reaction against the Anti-Slavery movement in particular, and to screw down the brakes upon the top rapid progress of Destiny in general. He would state that, as the defection of Georgey was talked of in London before it took place in Hungary, so that of Mr. Webster was counted on in State Street while the Honorable Senator himself was innocently writing home to his friends to inquire how strong a form of Anti-Slavery the Massachusetts stomach would bear. He would state as a certainty that the passage in Mr. Webster's speech relating to Mr. Hoar's mission was not delivered in the Senate but was an afterthought sent on for insertion in the Boston edition.

So much by way of previous history. Now in regard to the speech itself. It has been characterized, like most of Mr. Webster's speeches, as "a masterly effort." Some of them have been masterly successes, but this, we sincerely hope and believe, *was* an effort. We think we notice, in the course of it, one or two scarce-concealed gulps as the Oregon speech was swallowed. And it was, moreover, the effort, not of a Senator representing Massachusetts, but of an advocate holding the brief of State Street. It is a matter of debate in the newspapers whether or no Mr. Webster is sustained by the public sentiment of Boston. It seems to be forgotten that the distinguished Senator represents an undivided half of the Bay State. He has remembered that he was the delegate of Boston, but has apparently forgotten that Bunker Hill and Concord have also their share in him, nay, it seems to have slipped from his mind that he represented Daniel Webster the man, no less than Daniel Webster the aspirant for the Presidency.

We have touched upon the first great objection to the speech, and it is a fatal one. It is the plea of a lawyer and an advocate, but not of a statesman. It is not even the plea of an advocate on the side which he was retained to argue. We have heard enough of democratic defalcations; here is a great Whig defalcation which dwarfs them all, for it is not money which has disappeared in this instance, but professions, pledges, principles. Men do not defend themselves in advance against accusations of inconsistency, unless they feel an uncomfortable sense that there is some justice in the charge. This feeling pervades a great part of Mr. Webster's speech like a blush. While Mr. Webster's private correspondents in Boston were spreading the tremulous intelligence, not without due awe of the result, that he was about to swoop,

"Like an eagle,
And bolt his cloudless thunder on the heads"

of southern cacklers, behold, he quietly descends and takes his perch beside them on the roost like any tame villatic fowl.

Mr. Webster begins by what may be considered an apology for Slavery in the abstract, as it is called, although we must confess that after diligent inquiry, we have been unable to discover where that particular kind of servitude exists now, or has ever existed. We do not exactly see what Greek, Roman, or Jewish Slavery has to do with the Wilmot Proviso, but as Mr. Webster has seen fit to bring them in, it may be worth while to set him right in his facts. It was *not* "the ingenious philosophy of the Greeks which found, or sought to find, a justification for it (Slavery) precisely upon the grounds which have been assumed for such a justification in this country; that is, a natural and original difference among the races of mankind

Was it a Senator from South Carolina, or from Massachusetts, who was speaking? Surely a lower bid for the Presidency has never been made than this.

But how is it about the Wilmot Proviso? Mr. Webster has two reasons to assign against its passage. One is that it is useless, and the other that it is irritating to the South. If it be useless why was our advocate in favor of it in the case of Oregon? Why did he claim such a mere *brutum fulmen* as "his thunder?" An inaccuracy in fact, by the way, like his "proclaiming" in 1843 the design to annex Texas. Why, the Abolitionists had already bored the community to death with it. Dr. Channing had "proclaimed" it years before, and John Quincy Adams. But who knows that the Proviso is useless? Mr. Webster says that it is, and that Slavery is excluded from New Mexico by the law of nature and of physical geography. Excellent good words, but where is the proof? Why, it is Mr. Webster's opinion. But Mr. Webster has held opinions against the Tariff and in favor of the Tariff, in favor of the Wilmot Proviso and against it. If Slavery should get into New Mexico (and let us remember that it has been asserted all along by Southern men in Congress that it would have got into California but for the fear of the Proviso) it would be no particular satisfaction to be told that Mr. Webster thought it never could. Mr. Webster would not, he says, re-enact the laws of God. Why, all human laws are an attempt at that very thing. It is just in proportion as the laws of society or of the State diverge from that intention that confusion and anarchy are produced.

The use of the Proviso is to set a definite limit to the Extension of Slavery, to put upon record the will of the People that they must have no more of it. Mr. Webster's argument, or rather assertion, that the laws of nature and God will keep Slavery out of New Mexico is puerile. Slavery everywhere exists in spite of those laws and not in accordance with them. Mr. Calhoun's plea in defence of Slavery rests not upon any assumption that cotton could not be cultivated as well by black freemen as by black slaves. Quite otherwise, he would maintain the institution because it festers pride, the habit of command, a state of aristocracy, and other such Christian virtues. Mr. Webster is scrupulous about reenacting the laws of God, and we wish he had felt as much delicacy about those of Satan.

Mr. Webster, we have said, avoids carefully all the moral points of the argument. He falls in with the common assumption that this is a question of political preponderance between the North and the South. Nay, he goes even farther and would reduce it to a mere matter of sectional prejudice, the result of habit and education. Had it been a question of political supremacy it would have been no disgrace to Mr. Webster to have remembered that he came from the North. Had it been a matter of prejudice, it would not have lessened his reputation for wisdom if he had retained some prepossession in favor of freedom. Had the North been as faithfully and energetically represented at Washington as the South has been, the limit would have been set, and quietly set, to the extension of Slavery long ago. But it is not a question between the North and the South. It is a struggle between the South (we had almost said Calhoun) and the spirit of the Nineteenth Century after Christ. But Mr. Webster would not press the Wilmot Proviso lest it irritate the South. Was he equally considerate when South Carolina nullified on account of the Tariff? Is Slavery the only thing whose sensitiveness is to be respected? Freedom has been thought by some to have her finer feelings also. Did Mr. Calhoun stop to enquire whether Freedom had a system of nerves when he introduced resolutions prohibiting the employment of free colored men in the national vessels? Mr. Webster might have remembered that a Senator represents fidelity, justice, probity, honor, no less than the mercantile and manufacturing interests. He should have considered that the duty of a Statesman lies in preparing his age and his country for the inevitable progress of events, not in contriving expedients for putting it off from day to day, renewing, as it were, with a constant accumulation of interest the pledges we have given to Fate, and crowding back into a deluge by an exaggeration of petty obstacles that current of events which might otherwise have flowed full, indeed, but still between the banks of recognized order.

It is of the first importance that the mind of the country should be cleared of this confusion of the two terms South and Slavery. If we may believe Mr. Calhoun, it is the South which has all along been a sufferer by the legislation of the country. The system of aggression, he says, began under the Confederation, and has continued to the present day. There has never been a time when Slavery has not been the governing interest (we should rather say disaster) of the Union. The exclusion of Slavery from the North Western territory, or from any other territory, is no wrong done to the South, but only a preservation of equality between her and the North. The admission of Slavery would have been an entire exclusion of the North. But, admitting for the purpose of the argument, Mr. Clay's doctrine that what the law makes property is property, the Wilmot Proviso merely leaves matters even between the two sections. The slaveholder may turn his "property" into money before emigrating to California or New Mexico, just as the Northern freeman is obliged to do with his. But Slavery prohibits the entrance of that kind of capital which makes the true riches of a State, freemen, the masters only of strong arms and skilful hands.

We may as well correct another of Mr. Webster's mistakes or perversions of fact before we close our article. As if to make his speech a perfect cabinet of cant, he has a specimen of that sort which attributes to the Abolitionists the cessation of all freedom of speech at the South in regard to the evils of Slavery. He refers in confirmation of this absurdity to the Virginia Convention of 1832 and the denunciations of Slavery by several distinguished delegates to it. Then he tells us that the Anti-Slavery agitation commenced in 1835, and wishes to know whether any one can speak as freely in the Old Dominion now. If Mr. Webster should ever chance to see a file of *The Liberator*, he would find the imprint of the first number bearing the date of January 1, 1831, and the "*Genius of Universal Emancipation*" had been previously published for several years in Washington and Baltimore. The truth is that Slavebreeding is more profitable, and therefore, more orthodox, in Virginia now than then. Mr. Webster might have obtained this information from that very paper of Mr. Upshur's which he refers to. To every thinking man it must be apparent that an increase of severity and watchfulness from year to year is an essential incident of the slave-system. As numbers increase, as hope, desire, and intelligence are indefinably diffused as by the atmosphere of the time, tyranny must grow ever more suspicious and more alert. If Slavery were as unprofitable to slaveholders individually as it is to the States in which it exists, not all the fanaticism of all the Abolitionists would suffice to keep down discussion. There is a Yankee proverb about people who bite off their noses to spite their faces, but this kind of amusement is too expensive for a continuance. Slavery is profitable to slaveholders in many ways, but especially as it has enabled them to maintain that political supremacy which Mr. Webster is willing to extend and strengthen. It would have been as well for him to have awakened earlier to the evils of the exasperation springing from those insults to which one section of the country is subjected by another. He tells us that there are complaints of the North against the South, but that he "need not go over them particularly." Why not? What else was he sent there for? Does he sit in the Senate of the United States to defend Massachusetts from insult and her citizens from outrage, or to look out for the Presidential chances of Daniel Webster? If it be an insult to the South to have Slavery excluded from New Mexico, why was it not an insult to the North to have Freedom forever forbidden to enter Texas?

It is said that Mr. Webster's speech is sustained by the public sentiment of Boston, and we believe it. It is sustained by numbers who have always wished to say the same thing but have never dared to. When a struggle like the one now going on rends and rifts the foundations of political parties, dormant old fogies are wakened and brought to light, with ideas and principles as naturally antediluvian as those of toads split out of granite. But Mr. Webster is not sustained by Massachusetts. There are some who really believed the professions of the Whig leaders that the Wilmot Proviso would be safe in the keeping of their party. Safe as freedom in the keeping of Austria, as a younger brother in the guardianship of the Grand Turk!

If Mr. Webster's speech should not find any one to confute it in the Senate—a hard task, for assumptions and tergiversations are not easily replied to—it will not be without answerers abundant and conclusive. It will be answered by every generous instinct of the human heart, by every principle which a New Englander has imbibed in the Church, the Schoolhouse, or the Home, but especially by those inextinguishable sentiments which move men's hatred of treachery and contempt for the traitor.—J. R. L.

RETALIATION BY VIRGINIA.—The Governor of Virginia has sent a message to the Legislature of that State recommending a course of retaliation against the State of Ohio because the Governor of that State has refused to surrender a free negro charged with criminally walking out of Virginia on his own two legs contrary to the peace and good order of the Virginian Institutions. He says:

"I am of the opinion that a system of taxation under the License Law can be so arranged as to transfer entirely the trade from those States which have trampled under foot the Constitution of the United States, to those who are still willing to abide by its compromises and recognize our rights under it. This would be a peaceful and efficient remedy, doubly recommended to us because it is under our own exclusive control, and the work of our own authorities.

"We now tax a tin-pedlar ten dollars a year, while a clock pedlar has to pay fifty. The venders of all articles manufactured in the recusant States could be taxed one hundred per cent. and the vender be required to show where the articles were made. Pains and penalties could be easily attached to any evasion of the law, which would ensure the due enforcement of it. The details could be made to embrace live stock and the produce of the soil."

MR. WEBSTER'S CHAIN.—A beautiful and valuable chain, so say the papers, has been presented to Mr. Webster by some successful adventurer just returned from California, who takes that method to do his share to verify the truth of a homely old proverb. So good an opportunity to "paint a moral" is not to be lost, and is seized accordingly by Mr. Webster's admirers, and those whose *fetisch* is the Constitution, to renew their adoration of the one, and adulation of the other. 'The golden chain whereby our fathers bound us,' and 'riveted and strengthened' by Mr. Webster, are figures which nobody speaks about the matter without enlarging upon as they are blessed with taste and ability. The chain is a gift to the whole editorial fraternity, but more especially to that part of it who think chains a blessing, as a general thing, though not of gold.

We shall not yield to such a temptation of being either witty or sentimental. If we might be indulged in a single remark, however, it would be that the donor showed himself no fool, at least, in the material and shape he chose to express his admiration of Mr. Webster's patriotism. The Massachusetts thunderer never weares any but golden chains.

☞ A WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT of the *Evening Post* asserts that Senator Foote knew, for once, what he was talking about when he announced the Dissolution of the Union to come off on the Monday following. This writer asserts that the Southern members were on bloody thoughts, interests, and resolving on bloodydeeds in case the Resolutions calling upon the Committee on Territories to bring in a bill for the admission of California had been pushed through that day, and that the disastrous consummation was only warded off by Mr. Doty's bill which took the place of Resolutions, doing directly what, if we understand it, they proposed to do indirectly. The Post man has but just begun his apprenticeship if he believes such stories as these.

RECEIPTS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FAIR.—The *Freeman* publishes the following report of the receipts at the different tables at the late Fair, which will interest those concerned who may not have already seen it:

City Table,	No. 1,	$50 56
Do.	2,	150 18
Do.	3,	146 25
Do.	4,	69 76
Book Table,		78 16
English Table,		204 76
French "		77 94
Byberry "		60 35
Kennett "		48 91
Lower Merion,		25 00
Newtown,		103 52
Darby,		61 96
Bristol,		71 50

MRS. FANNY KEMBLE.—We had heard, and with regret, that Mrs. Kemble at one of her public readings in Boston read from Longfellow's new poem, "The Building of the Ship," the passage so laudatory of the Union, wherewith the poet had mended a reputation slightly damaged by his earlier Anti-Slavery poems. We have also heard it asserted, by way of extenuation, that the reading was by particular request, an explanation which we gladly hope is true as redeeming the Anti-Slavery character of the noble woman who has refused, on two or three occasions, to receive the money of slaveholders in return for her public readings. However this may be, we are gratified to learn from the Boston correspondent of the *Literary World* that so far as a Boston audience is concerned even Mrs. Kemble's art does not recommend the work of the poet. He says:

Mrs. Fanny Kemble has been reading Shakspeare here for several weeks with great success. Last week she gave a reading before the Mercantile Library Association, of the first and second acts of *As you Like It*, and Mr. Longfellow's new poem, "The Building of the Ship." There was an audience present of about three thousand persons, and she read finely, particularly in the latter piece, but for all the enthusiasm which her kindling eye and deep-toned voice created, she might as well have read it to about the same number of lamp-posts. The thrilling passages at the close of the poem, speaking of the Union ship of state, were passed by almost unnoticed. It was a strange sight; the gifted Englishwoman reading these lines with such a depth of feeling, that her voice trembled, to an audience of Americans, who so far from being moved by them to any generous expression of sympathy, seized their hats and rushed for the doors, as if a premium had been offered to those who should get out first.

CONGRESS.—We have no room this week, for our usual summary of Congressional proceedings, as the speech of Mr. Seward occupies so large a share in our columns. Our readers we presume will agree with us that it is refreshing to turn to that from the pro-slavery lucubrations of Messrs. Calhoun, Clay, and Webster. As the advocates of freedom have at length got their turn we may hope soon to hear from Messrs. Hale and Chase in the Senate and Messrs. Giddings, Allen, Root and others in the House.

HON. JOHN P. HALE will accept our thanks for copies of several recent speeches in Congress. Our acknowledgments are also due to Hon WM. H. SEWARD for a copy of the speech with which we occupy a large portion of this No of the *Standard*.

☞ THE RHODE ISLAND FREE SOIL CONVENTION, held last week at Providence, made the following nominations:

For Governor—Edward Harris. For Lieutenant Governor—Benjamin R. Thurston. For Secretary—Samuel R. Jackson. For General Treasurer—George H. Church.

ERRORS EXCEPTED.—Some curious people have discovered a singular discrepancy in the different copies of Mr. Webster's Speech published for consumption in different latitudes. The Northern copy, as that for instance sent to the *Boston Courier*, and revised by Mr. Webster himself, contained one paragraph which was omitted in the report of the Washington papers, and omitted also, so says the *Tribune*, in the delivery of the speech itself. The sentence read thus:

"There is a more tangible and irritating cause of grievance at the North. Free blacks are constantly employed in the vessels of the North generally as cooks or stewards. When the vessel arrived, these free colored men are taken on shore, by the police or municipal authority, imprisoned, and kept in prison till the vessel is again ready to sail. This is not only irritating but exceedingly inconvenient in practice, and seems altogether impracticable and oppressive. Mr. Hoar's mission, some time ago, to South Carolina, was a well-intended effort to remove this cause of complaint. The North thinks such imprisonment illegal and unconstitutional; as the cases occur constantly and frequently, they think it a great grievance."

Surely, where so much had been said of the northern duty of catching Southern negroes, thus much might be borne as an appeal to Southern courtesy to let Northern negroes alone; and even South Carolina considering that she got the better in that contest, might have suffered the allusion to Mr. Webster's personal friend Judge Hoar, who removed 'no cause of complaint' except himself, on his remarkable mission. If there was, however, any reason for omitting such a paragraph from the southern edition of the speech, no better test can be made of the value of the Union which the speech has intended to strengthen.

But we observe that the *National Intelligencer* denies that there was any difference made by Mr. Webster in his revision of the different copies. The fact nevertheless remains the same, that there was this difference, and though Mr. Webster may be absolved from the guilt of having done so cowardly and mean a thing—if indeed any more mean and cowardly than the speech itself—somebody did it who understands the relation between the North and South

WE are indebted to Hon. HORACE MANN for a copy of his recent speech in the House of Representatives on the Slavery question.

HON WM. DUER.—Will also accept our acknowledgments for a public Document, and to Hon. D. R. KING, we are indebted for a favor of a similar character.

To Correspondents.

H. G. We have received his rejected communication and will find room for it next week.

H W. G. We had scarcely made the inquiries, and were about writing when his letter reached us. He shall hear at our first leisure moment.

DR. A. OF T. His letter was received, and the paper is paid for for six months longer. We shall continue it for that time unless otherwise directed.

Domestic Correspondence.

From Our Boston Correspondent.

NO. LVIII.

THE ARGUMENT.—*Sensation caused by Mr. Webster's Speech.—The Correspondent commendeth the Electric Telegraph.—And why?—He treateth of "Skip" and of the devouring of words.—He grieveth over Whig dissention.—Atlas and Advertiser.—Lowell Republican, State Street and Milk Street, The Correspondent perplexed.—He giveth an Exegesis on Statesmanship.—Sins of Omission of Mr. Webster.—The Correspondent on the South, Mr. Webster's chances and Wooden Nutmegs.—Confusion in Whig Camp.—Possible Public Meetings.—The Correspondent on policy of Free Soilers.—The Disunion Petitions in the Senate.—Mr. Hillard's patriotic demonstration.—Its success.—Who he is.—His recal from Coventry.—His political prospects and the cause of them.—&c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, March 15, 1850.

As you may well suppose little has been talked of for the last ten days but Mr. Webster's Speech. As your Corresponding Editor expressed my sentiments, very nearly, last week, I shall not trouble you with any extended comments on that Oration, but merely say "*ditto*" to the eminent gentleman in question. As he intimated the Speech was a sore trial to the Whigs, and it was worse when the corrected and emendated copy arrived, inasmuch as it bettered the very worst foreshadowings of the Telegraphic Despatch. For my own part, I must own a partiality for that mode of Transmission. I have a notion that lightning is not only swift, but true when it flashes along the wires. The salient points and *piquant* expressions of the speaker are caught and dished up for you while yet wriggling with life, like a trout which flaps itself from the water into the frying pan, before the angler has an opportunity to clean them fit for his home market. There is this disadvantage attending the discovery, to be sure, that one is obliged to read everything over two or three times. But then the Telegraph usually contrives to extract all the essence of what is said and to send it on to you in a concentrated form, like shrimp sauce or anchovy paste, and thereby to direct an experienced reader to those convenient portions well known to all students of novels by the generic name of "*Skip*." Mr. Webster's Speech, however, had none of this convenient element in it, but he who applies himself to it must be content to swallow every word set before him. Which, indeed, is an easy task compared with that undertaken by the illustrious Orator himself, of devouring his own words, himself. That great man, certainly, must have the infanticidal appetite of the old ogre Saturn, joined with the deglutition of an anaconda and the digestion of an ostrich, to have been able to make away with so many little innocents of his own fathering.

You will be grieved to hear that this Speech has been the cause of at least the appearance of division in the ranks of the Anti-Slavery Whig party. The *Atlas* and the *Advertiser* have taken opposite sides upon this theme, which may be premonitory of a Schism in the Whig Church Universal. The *Lowell Republican*, explains this controversy on an hypothesis that must puzzle future historians and commentors, viz., that the *Advertiser* looks at the question from the stand-point of State Street and the *Atlas* from that of Milk Street. I cannot imagine that the circumstance of Mr. Lawrence's counting-room being in Milk Street can have any thing to do with this enigmatical proposition. But being no Sphinx, and my worst enemies admitting that I am 'no conjurer,' I must leave its solution to more cunning heads than mine. The predominating feeling, among the mass even of the Whig party, I believe to be mortification and disgust. In conversation they do not hesitate to denounce Mr. Webster and his speech in no measured terms. How they will stand the test of the application of the political grind-stone to their nasal promontories, when the time comes for the revolution of that main wheel of the machinery for making voters, can be better foretold after the event has come to pass. Mr. Webster's admirers, however, defend him and his speech on their own merits, and an intermediate class claim admiration for them both on the ground of the "*Statesman-like*" properties of the speech. The word "*Statesmanship*," like the word "accommodate" was "an excellent good word until it was ill-sorted," but since it has been perverted to mean an ingenious method of lying and the boldest form of insolent demand on the part of the South and of grovelling servility on the part of the North, the sooner its definition is amended in all honest dictionaries, the better.

There was but one thing wanted to complete the ineffable meanness of this lion turned spaniel in his fawnings on the masters whose hands he was licking for the sake of the dirty puddings they might have to toss to him. I was assured by a gentleman of the Whig party, who heard the speech, that even the sneaking allusion to the imprisonment of our coloured seamen in Southern ports, and the treatment of Mr. Hoar, at Charleston, contained in the printed speech *was not delivered* in the Senate; but it seemed as if he must have been mistaken. This fact is admitted by the *Atlas* this morning, which excuses it as a customary circumstance. Is it so, indeed! Are any of Mr. Calhoun's or Mr. Foote's diatribes against the North ever omitted in the delivery, and supplied only in the Report? And, yet again, are their denunciations of Northern invasions of their rights suppressed in the Northern papers, while they are sent South for local effect? This, I am well assured is the case with regard to this passage of Mr. Webster's speech. Your Southern Exchanges will enable you to know the rights of this matter, and I hope you will let us know how it stands. I know (these eyes being witnesses) that THIS PASSAGE IS OMITTED IN THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER! And, then, in the next paragraph he has the impudence to say "as far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law they can be redressed!" I should like to have Mr. Webster point out *how*, when, if he, himself, should go to South Carolina or Louisiana to initiate a suit at law to redress them, he would be sentenced to the punishment of a burglar or a highway robber,—"involuntary servitude *for* crime!" I think Mr. Webster misunderstands the slaveholding character, if he thinks that he has purchased Southern support for the Presidency by his swift sycophancy. They have had dealings so long with chapmen such as he in wooden nutmegs and other wares not to have their wits about them. They may use him, but they will not trust him, and they would be fools if they did.

The confusion into which the Whig camp has been thrown by this demonstration (a confusion not lessened by the cordial endorsement of it by the *Post*, the organ of the Old Hunker Democrats) has not yet sufficiently subsided to enable them to take any definite action about it. There is talk of a meeting at Faneuil Hall of the friends of Mr. Webster and the admirers of his Speech, to give vent to their ecstacies on this auspicious occasion. This is almost too good to be true. But should it come off, you need not fear but that your Correspondent will be *thar*. I was in hopes that the disaffected wing of the Whigs would give a public utterance of their sense of this matter, or, at least, that the Free Soilers would not fail to seize the helping hand which Mr. Webster is holding out to them to pull them out of the slough in which they are stuck fast. But I fear that they want either grace or else the wisdom that is profitable to direct; for they give no sign of any such tendency. I am afraid that they incline still to fall back upon the policy of a "Masterly Inactivity,"—which is the best of all for the perpetuation of a mischievous System, but the worst in the world for those proposing to attack it. So it is quite likely we poor Disunionists will have to bear the brunt of the battles, as far as good, hearty, wholesome denunciation is concerned. We have a Memorial in circulation asking our Legislature humbly to express its opinion on the subjects on which Mr. Webster himself admits that he so much needs instruction, while he declares his intention of disregarding any he does not like. We shall, probably, hold a Meeting in Faneuil Hall, next week, and perhaps one at Plymouth, besides the regular Old Colony Meeting on Fast Day at Bridgewater. If I should be cognizant of any matters of interest to your readers I shall not withhold them, but, contrawise, do good and communicate.

I told you when I informed you of the fate of our Disunion petitions in the House, that strange as it might appear, we had still life enough left in us to attack the Honorable Senate. This we did. The Hon. and Rev. Mr. Upham, of Salem, moved to lay our petition on the table. This was negatived (the Senate having at least profited by the blunder of the House) by a large vote and they were referred to the Judiciary Committee.—This Committee, of course, very succinctly reported leave to withdraw. The Hon. George S. Hillard, the unfortunate object of a compliment from Mr. Webster in his late speech, moved that a hearing be given the petitioners, in consequence of a letter from Mr. Garrison and others asking one, though he intimated his intention of voting against his own motion. When it came up a profitable debate ensued, in which Mr. Amasa Walker and Mr. Carynean advocated the hearing, and Mr. Hillard opposed it. This gentleman seemed apprehensive of coming within the penalty of treason, if this question were entertained, and vehemently appealed to the patriotic sympathies of the Senate to put a stopper upon any such seditious proceeding. Which was incontinently done, and the Republic for the time being, was saved. Mr. Hillard is a gentleman of considerable literary acquirements and of a style of writing which is admired in this country, who was put into Coventry by the Whigs some fifteen years ago for some good action of his when a member of the Legislature, when our Laws were revived, about oaths or capital punishment, or something of the sort. During the Taylor campaign he was in Europe, and as he was considered a member of that wing of the Whigs, abusively styled Conscience Whigs and jocosely "the Society for Mutual Admiration," there was some curiosity to know what he would do when he came home. This was soon settled by his appearing at the Worcester Convention and doing suit and service to the Lord Paramount of Whigdom He was forthwith recalled from his exile in Coventry and sent to the Senate of this State. And it is understood, if he do nothing to forfeit favour, that he is the preordained successor of Mr. Winthrop whenever that gentleman is raised to the higher places. The fact is that the Secession of the Free Soilers carried away almost the entire talent of the Whig party under fifty years old. Mr. Hillard, though a man of at least average talents and of considerable industry, could hardly have expected this advancement had it not been for the "bloody war and sickly season" that swept away so many who were before him in the regular line of promotion.—D. Y.

"Sons of Temperance."

MR GAY:—Having opened the subject, and stated my position and the cause of my taking this stand, I have waited a little to allow any who might think proper to reply. I now proceed in the examination of this subject. I may perhaps expose this "Order" no farther than its degrading connection with slaveholding villains. I shall endeavor to prove, to the honest, whatever I shall say; therefore I defy all pro-slavery logic this side of the Rio Grande. But, sir, if called upon, I am prepared to investigate this "Order" to its very core And I am not to be bought with either kicks or kindness.

If what I have before said is true, (and I will prove it,) then it must be plain to any man's common sense, that the "Order" has trampled under foot its obligation with all men, of sense and honesty. Whenever any person is to be initiated, the W. P. thus addresses him. "Respected sir; You are now about to take upon yourself a solemn and binding obligation, which, farther than you have been informed, will not interfere with your *religious* or *political* opinions, be they what they may. With this declaration of neutrality on our part, are you still willing to proceed?" Now, I ask, what is a man's politics or religion worth, that can justify chattel Slavery? Such politics or religion is a disgrace to the human species. Therefore the "Order" has trampled upon its obligation, with every well-disposed member who may have regard to truth, justice and humanity.

This "Order" claims to be a moral institution. It will *reject* and *eject* those known to be guilty of certain immortalities. It will expel a member for robbing another man of his pocket book; but *if he steals the whole man*, his pocket book and all, he is a very *moral and honorable* man, and "*a proper person to become*" and remain "*a Son of Temperance*"! Though he take from the man the product of his labor, the ownership of his own flesh and blood, the wife of his bosom, his children dearer to him than his own blood, and doom them, amid shrieks and groans of heart-rung agony, to chains and Slavery—though he do all this, still he is a *moral man*, an *honorable* "*Son of Temperance*"! You take this infamous robber and dealer in human flesh and blood, this butcher of human affections, to your bosoms as *an honorable S. of T.*—you admit him into any of your Divisions as such—you submit willingly to his dictation and direction! And yet you are a "*moral institution*," and will not interfere with MEN'S religious or political opinions!

But I stated that the Grand Division of N. Y. had refused a Charter to colored men to form a Division by themselves. Now for the proof. At a special Session of the Grand Division held March 25, 1844, an application from Mr. Ogden and associates, (colored) was presented, "praying for a Charter to form a new Division, to be called the Wilberforce Division, No 29 of the City and State of New York."

On motion, the application was referred to Cushing, Griffith, and Cromwell, "with instructions to inquire into the expediency of granting the Charter, and report at the next quarterly session." This is extracted from their own proceedings. Now it is customary when white men apply for a Charter, to refer the matter "*to the usual Committee, with power, and the blank filled with*"—the number of the new Division. Thus we find a distinction of color, made too, without authority. But let us see what this Committee report at the next Regular Session April 8, 1844.

"To &c. &c."—"The Chairman of your committee called on Mr. Ogden in order to ascertain on what conditions the applicants would consent to receive a Charter, if granted. His answer was most emphatic, that if granted, it must be on terms of perfect equality, without the least reservation whatever. Therefore, without going into the argument at this time, why it is inexpedient to grant said Charter, we ask leave to submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Charter be not granted, and that the petitioners have leave to withdraw the same."

"HENRY K. CUSHING,
"E. GRIFFITH,
"W. A. CROMWELL,

"The Report and Resolution were both adopted."

According to this Report, when these *negro haters* put this insulting question to him, he answered in the true dignity of a man. What other answer *could* he as an honest man give? When a colored man presents himself for admission into a northern church, is he waited upon by a Committee to know on what terms he will consent to be admitted? But I am making this communication too lengthy. I will however speak further of this matter hereafter, showing the base truckling and cringing of the "Order to the Southern slaveholders. I will however here say, gladly, that the "CALEDONIA DIVISION" does grant Charters to colored men; but, for this or some other cause, (which I will endeavor to learn,) their connection with the Grand Division has been cut, and they are no longer in fellowship with other Divisions. I would say, too, in praise of the "CADETS OF TEMPERANCE," that they have granted Charters to colored boys to form Sections. But the motto of the Grand Division and the National Division is—*Down with the blacks, and honor to the robbers of Humanity.*

In truth yours,

MATTHEW FARRINGTON.

WAPPINGER'S FALLS, MARCH 8, 1850.

General Intelligence.

OUT OF HER SPHERE.—A man was knocked down and robbed by two women, in the streets of Boston, on Monday night.

——A Mr. Hazeltine was excluded from testifying in one of the courts of Boston, the other day, on the ground that he was "an avowed atheist."

——The Springfield Republican states that Mr. Orrin P. Wilson, of that town, has laid an egg on their table! A fact in Physiology that needs investigation.

——"WASHINGTONS."—The first instalment of Double Eagles or Washingtons, which were ordered to be coined by the last Congress have been received in this city. They are of the value of twenty dollars.

——By a report of the Secretary of State, it appears that there are 2,017 miles of plank roads in this State, in which there is capital invested to the amount of $3,700,000.

——The Legislature of Massachusetts has granted an act of incorporation to an association to be entitled the New England Art Union. Edward Everett, Professor Longfellow, Franklin Dexter, Esq., and others, are among the Board of Managers.

——The English papers confirm the statement that the only daughter of the Rev. P. Bronte, incumbent of Haworth, near Bradford, in Yorkshire, is the authoress of "Jane Eyre" and "Shirley," two popular novels, which have appeared under the name of "Currer Bell."

——A NOVEL MODE OF SMUGGLING.—The United States *vs.* certain Diamonds.—In this case a foreign letter was put into the Post Office, the appearance of which excited such suspicion as to cause its being opened, when it was found to contain diamonds, to the value of $600, which were attempted to be thus smuggled in order to avoid paying the duty. The Court declared them to be forfeited.

——LOUIS NAPOLEON.—*Non Compos Mentis.*—The Washington correspondent of the *Philadelphia Pennsylvanian* makes this allusion to some curious reports concerning new troubles in France.

"Washington is running wild over a letter from a former French Minister to the United States, saying that Louis Napoleon had gone hopelessly crazy, and is about to resign, proclaiming Henry V. King of France, and the Count de Paris heir to the throne, in the case of Henry's death without issue. Such a letter has doubtless been received by a diplomatist here."

——ADVICE TO GENERAL TAYLOR.—Among the recent curious ceremonies at Washington, was a presentation made by Jo. Hoxie and others to the President of the United States, of a silver curry-comb for the use of "Old Whitey," and also of a fish with sparkling eyes, which was sent to him as a present from a piscatory club of this city.

——THE NORFOLK KIDNAPPING CASE.—The *Norfolk Herald* states that Captain Lambden, who was sent to jail there for attempting to sell three colored men who shipped on board of his schooner at Philadelphia, was examined on Friday, and discharged for want of evidence to convict him. The colored men are in jail, waiting the necessary evidence of their freedom, upon the receipt of which, they too will be discharged.

——HUNGARIANS IN NEW YORK.—Fifteen hundred dollars were collected in behalf of the Hungarians, at the meeting in the Tabernacle, the other evening.

——The *Lowell Vox Populi* says that Rev. Mr. Hardy, formerly of this city, (Lowell) is now the successful proprietor of a monte table in San Francisco, and reputed to be worth a hundred thousand dollars.

——THE FORREST DIVORCE CASE.—The Judiciary Committee in the State Senate of Pennsylvania have reported a bill to annul the marriage contract between Mr. and Mrs. Forrest.

——HEAVY DAMAGES.—Mr. James Collins has recovered $11,000 damages of the Schenectady Railroad Company, for injuries sustained by him by a collision of the trains of the company, on 5th November, 1848.

——Mr. Henry Grinnell has succeeded in purchasing one of the two vessels required in his projected exploring expedition to the Arctic Seas. It is a small brig of about eighty tons burthen. These vessels are to be sent about the first of May next, directly for the shores of Wellington's inlet and Cape Walker, where a rigid search after traces of Sir John Franklin will be set on foot. One of the brigs will be called, appropriately, the "Advance," and the other, the "Rescue."—*Evening Post.*

——THE (Vermont) *Burlington Free Press* has discovered and put at the head of its Editorial columns with the title of "The Whig Anti-Slavery Platform" the following *morceau:*

"My opposition to the increase of Slavery in this country, or to the increase of slave representation in Congress, is general and universal. It has no reference to the lines of latitude or points of the compass. I shall oppose all such extension and all such incrsase, in all places, at all times, under all circumstances, even against all inducements, against all combination, against all compromise."—*Daniel Webster*, 1848.

——THE (Washington) *Union* of the 17th inst. contains the following:

"The rumors which have gone into circulation require some notice. There was a hasty quarrel between two of the most respectable Senators of the United States, on Thursday evening—Messrs. Borland, of Arkansas, and Foote, of Mississippi. It arose from a mistake; and it turned to blows, which were interchanged. We are happy to state that the difference has been made up, and the most amicable relations, which had a long time prevailed, are restored between the parties. Mr. Borland, who gave the first blow, having discovered his mistake, had the magnanimity frankly to acknowledge it."

MARRIAGES.

FIELDS—WILLARD.—March 13, by Rev. Mr. Garnett, James T. Fields, of the firm of Ticknor & Co., to Eliza Josephine, daughter of Simon Willard, Esq.

BUXTON—HOLLAND.—On the 7th inst., at St. George's Church, Hanover Square, London, by the Rev. Arthur P. Stanley, Charles Buxton, Esq., youngest son of the late Sir T. Fowell Buxton, Bart. to Emily Mary, eldest daughter of Dr. Holland of London.

PARRISH—PRICE.—On the 28th ult., according to the order of Friends, George D. Parrish, to Sarah L. daughter of Richard Price of Philadelphia.

SPAULDING—THOMPSON.—On the 4th inst., at Penn's Manor, Pennsylvania, by Friends' ceremony, Henry F. Spaulding, of New York, to Rose, daughter of the late Hector Thompson, of the former place.

DEATHS.

SEDGWICK.—In this city, on Wednesday afternoon, 18th inst., Mrs. Margaret Stuart Dean, wife of Roderick Sedgwick, in the 60th year of her age.

BEACH.—On the 13th inst. at Rochester, Gen. Ebenezer Beach, the well known flour merchant.

CHILD.—At Rochester, Sophia E. R. Child, wife of the Hon. Jonathan Child, daughter of Col. Nathaniel Rochester.

BARNITZ.—At York, Pa., on the 8th inst., Hon. Chas. A. Barnitz, formerly a member of the Pennsylvania Senate and the United States House of Representatives, in the 62d year of his age.

SEARS.—At Boston, March 10, Cordelia, daughter of Hon. David Sears.

WILLIAMS.—In Ann Arbor, Mich., Mrs. Elizabeth E., wife of the Rev. George P. Williams, professor in the Michigan University, and daughter of the late Gen. Joseph Edson, of Randolph, Vermont, 45.

THOMAS.—In Chicago, Hon. Isaac B. Thomas, of the Supreme Court of Illinois.

PARK.—On the 23d ult., at Myreton, N. B., Jean Park, aged 89, relict of Mr. Andrew Thomson, and only surviving sister of Mungo Park, the African traveller.

BREWSTER.—On the 27th ult., at Edinburgh, Lady Brewster, wife of Sir David Brewster, and youngest daughter of the late James Macpherson, of Belleville.

HOWARD.—In Paris on the morning of the 20th ult., of typhus fever, aged 23 years and 3 months, Hon. Mrs. Henry G. Howard, only daughter of John MacTavish, Esq., Her Britanic Majesty's Consul for the State of Maryland, and great-grand-daughter of the late Charles Carroll, of Carrollton.

MAURY.—On the 8th instant, in Orange County, Md., at the residence of her husband, Lieutenant William Lewis Maury, United States Navy, Mrs. Mary Hill Maury.

CAUTION.

ALL persons are hereby cautioned against the imposition of WILLIAM JONES, once a slave, who is going from place to place, collecting money, on the pretence of wishing to purchase his wife and children. He was last heard of in New Bridgewater. He has already collected upwards of $120, and can give no account of its appropriation.

Knowing him to have been a slave, and giving credence to other parts of his story, I was induced, in September last, to give him a recommendatory letter, which has aided him in raising the above sum. He promised to deposit his collections with me, for safe keeping, which he has not done. A month since, I withdrew that letter, and warned him to cease his deceptions on the public. But he has been false in this, as in other cases, and it now becomes my duty to give this publicity to his course, and to caution all persons against being further deceived by him.

P. S. Let it be noticed that the above-mentioned person is not the THOMAS JONES, from North Carolina, who spoke at the late annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in Faneuil Hall, and who has recently published a brief Narrative of his experience in Slavesy forty-three years.

Boston, Feb. 22d. SAMUEL MAY, JR.

ESSEX COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

A QUARTERLY meeting of the Essex-County A. S. Society will be held at Lynn on Saturday and Sunday, March the 23d and 24th, to commence at 3 o'clock, P. M The Board of Managers are desirous that this meeting should be one of the most spirited and profitable meetings ever held in the County. While Congress is almost wholly employed in discussing the questions, whether this curse of Slavery shall be extended over new regions of territory or be annihilated in the old—while the whole South are excited to action, and are calling Conventions to take measures to strengthen Slavery—surely the friends of Freedom ought to be equally vigilant and active. Come, then, one and all, and take counsel together, and devise means for the overthrow of this giant sin. Wm. L. Garrison, Lucy Stone, with other eloquent speakers, have engaged to be present. Rev. Samuel Johnson, of Salem, will address the friends at the close of the meeting, Sunday evening, upon the present aspect of the cause, and the duty of the Abolitionists. Per order of the Board of Managers

RUTH BUFFUM, Rec. Sec.

The Prisoners' Friend.

A NEW VOLUME COMMENCED IN SEPTEMBER.

Charles Spear, Editor and Proprietor.

A NEW VOLUME OF THE PRISONERS' FRIEND, commenced in September. Past experience, large observation, and extensive correspondence, both in the Old and New World have given the subscriber facilities possessed by few persons in this country for conducting such a work. The following will comprise the leading features of the work:

I. Valuable original articles on Criminal Reform.
II. A careful selection from the best foreign periodicals.
III. Reviews of valuable works on different moral topics.
IV. List of New Publications.
V. Public Education

Miscellany.

ROMANTIC STORY OF THE PITCAIRN ISLANDERS.

THERE are few persons unacquainted with that romance of naval history, the "Mutiny of the Bounty." Yet as we have some fresh information to give respecting Pitcairn's Island, and the descendants of the mutineers, even those acquainted with the story will not object to be reminded of it.

In 1789 his Majesty's armed vessel *Bounty*, while employed in conveying the bread-fruit-tree, from Tahiti to the British colonies in the West Indies, was taken from her commander, Lieutenant William Bligh, by a part of the crew; who headed by Fletcher Christian, a master's mate, mutinied off the Island of Tofoa, and put the Lieutenant, with the remainder of the crew—in all nineteen persons—into the launch. After a passage of 1,200 leagues, they arrived at a Dutch settlement on the Island of Timor. The mutineers, twenty-five in number, were supposed, from some expressions which escaped them when the launch was turned adrift, to have made sale towards Tahiti As soon as this circumstance was known to the Admiralty by the arrival of Bligh and his companions in England, Captain Edwards was ordered to proceed in the *Pandora* to that island, and endeavor to discover and bring to England the Bounty, with such of the crew as he might be able to secure. On his arrival, in March, 1791, at Matavia Bay, in Tahiti, four of the mutineers came voluntarily on board the Pandora to surrender themselves—and from information given by them, ten others (the whole number alive upon the island) were in the course of a few days taken;—and, with the exception of four who perished in the wreck of the Pandora, near Endeavor Strait, were conveyed to England for trial before a court martial, which adjudged six of them to suffer death, and acquitted the other four.

It became known to the commander of the Pandora, before he left the Pacific, that the mutineers remaining in the Bounty were reduced by desertion to no more than nine, and that they sailed away with several Tahitian men and women, each having taken one of the latter as his wife, on the 22nd September, 1789, intending to seek out some uninhabited island, and having established themselves on it, to break up the Bounty, so that all trace of them should be lost.

This was managed so securely that all Captain Edward's attempts to gain information of the Bounty and her crew at the numerous islands at which the Pandora touched failed, and nothing was heard of the mutineers for twenty years afterwards. In 1808 the American ship *Topaz*, of Boston, Captain Folgar, touched at Pitcairn's Island, in latitude 25 degrees 2 minutes South, and 130 degrees West longitude, and to his surprise, found it inhabited by the offspring of the mutineers, headed by Alexander Smith, who had changed his name to John Adams. It was ascertained that among those who originally landed were—besides Christian and Smith—Young, a midshipman, M'Coy, Mills, and Quintal, seamen, and Williams, armorer, together with six natives, their wives, and the wives of the Europeans. But now none of the men remained alive but Smith. The whole population amounted to thirty-five, who acknowledged Smith as their chief. They all spoke English, and had been educated by him in a moral and religious way.

It is somewhat singular that these facts did not become known till five years later—namely, till 1813. The succeeding year, Sir T. Staines of his Majesty's ship *Briton*, in company with Captain Pipon of the *Tagus*, both still in ignorance of Folgar's visit, accidentally approached the island.—They were not a little astonished, on nearing what they thought to be an uninhabited place, to behold plantations, regularly laid out, and huts, more neatly constructed than those on Marquesas Islands.—When about two miles from the shore, some natives were observed bringing down their canoes on their shoulders, dashing through a heavy surf, and paddling off to the ships; but their astonishment was unbounded on hearing one of them, on approaching the ship, call out in the English language, "Won't you heave us a rope now?"

The first man who got on board the Briton was "Thursday October Christian," the first born on the island, and son of Fletcher Christian. His only dress was a piece of cloth round his loins, and a straw hat, ornamented with the black feathers of the domestic fowl. "With a great share of good humor," says the Captain of the Tagus, "we were glad to trace in his benevolent countenance all the features of an honest English face * * * * I must confess," he continues, "I could not survey this interesting person without feelings of tenderness and compassion." His companion was George Young, a fine youth of seventeen or eighteen years of age. If the astonishment of the two Captains was great on hearing their first salutation in English, their surprise and interest were not a little increased on Sir Thomas Staines taking the youths below, and setting before them something to eat, when one of them rose up, and placing his hands before him in a posture of devotion, distinctly repeated, with a pleasing tone and manner.

"For what we are going to receive, the Lord make us truly thankful."

The two Captains accompanied these young men on shore; With some difficulty, and a good wetting, and with the assistance of their conductors, they accomplished a landing through the surf, and were soon after met by Smith, *alias* John Adams—a man between fifty and sixty years of age, who conducted them to his house. His wife, who was blind with age, accompanied him. He was at first alarmed lest the visit was to apprehend him—but on being told that they had been till that moment perfectly ignorant of his existence, he was relieved from his anxiety. Being once more assured that his visit was of a peaceable nature, it is impossible to describe the joy on seeing those whom they were pleased to consider as their countrymen. Yams, cocoa-nuts and other fruits, with fine fresh eggs, were laid before them; and the old man would have killed and dressed a hog for his visitors, but time would not allow them to partake of his intended feast.

The colony had now increased to about forty-six persons, mostly grown-up young people, besides a number of infants. The clothing of the females consisted of a piece of linen, reaching from the waist to the knees, and generally a sort of mantle thrown loosely over the shoulders, and hanging as low as the ankles—but this covering appeared to be intended chiefly as a protection against the sun and weather, as it was frequently laid aside, and it is not possible to conceive more beautiful forms than they exhibited. They sometimes wreathed caps or bonnets for the head, in the most tasteful manner, to protect the face from the rays of the sun—and though, as Captain Pipon observes, they only had the instruction of their Otaheitean mothers, "our dress-makers in London would be delighted with the simplicity, and yet elegant taste of these untaught females"

Their native modesty assisted by a proper sense of religion and morality instilled into their youthful minds by John Adams, had preserved these interesting people perfectly chaste, and free from all kinds of debauchery. They all labored, while young, in the cultivation of the ground; and when possessed of a sufficient quantity of cleared land, and of stock to maintain a family, they were allowed to marry; but always with the consent of Adams, who united them by a marriage ceremony of his own.

Such was the scanty information given to the world of this interesting colony till Captain Beechy visited it in the *Blossom*, in 1825 Not till then were the romantic adventures of the mutineers, after leaving Tahiti, reduced to writing. They were taken from Adams's own lips, and signed by him. The well-known "Narrative" of Captain Bligh, and Byron's poem of "The Island, or Christian and his Comrades," have since made them familiar to most readers.

It appeared that Christian, after having possessed himself of the Bounty, and while sailing away from Tahiti, advisedly selected Pitcairn's Island for his destination on reading Captain Cateret's account of it,* which was in the library of the Bounty. In January, 1790, he reached it, and landed all the stores from the ship, intending to destroy her, and with her all trace of the whereabouts of himself and his companions. Once established on the island, they felt their condition comfortable even beyond their most sanguine expectation; and everything went on peaceably and prosperously for about two years, when Williams, who had the misfortune to loose his wife about a month after his arrival, by a fall from a precipice while collecting bird's eggs, became dissatisfied, and threatened to leave the island in one of the boats of the Bounty unless he had another wife—an unreasonable request, which could not be complied with except at the expense of one of his companions; but Williams persisted in his threat, and the Europeans, not willing to part with him, on account of his usefulness as an armorer, constrained one of the natives to bestow his upon the applicant. The rest of the male natives, outrageous at this act of flagrant injustice, made common cause with their companion, and matured a plan of revenge upon their aggressors.

Their plot was revealed to the wives of the Europeans, and these ladies naturally, in such a desolate place, set too much value on their husbands not to give warning. The method in which they apprised these men of their danger is very characteristic and primitive, bringing to mind a scene in the "Lady of the Lake." They introduced into one of their songs the following words:—"Why does dark man sharpen axe? To kill white man? But the warning was unheeded, and all but three of the party were murdered, including Christian.

After this things went on pretty smoothly, till McCoy, who had been employed in a distillery in Scotland, tried an experiment with the tea-root, and succeeded in producing a bottle of ardent spirits This induced Quintal to "alter his kettle into a still," and the natural consequences ensued. Like the philosopher who destroyed himself by his own gunpowder, McCoy, intoxicated to frenzy, threw himself from a cliff, and was killed; and Quintal, having lost his wife by accident, demanded the lady of one of his two remaining companions. This modest request having been refused, he attempted to murder his countrymen, but they, having discovered his intention, agreed that as Quintal was no longer a safe member of their community, the sooner he was out of the way the better: accordingly, they split his skull with an axe. Adams and Young were now the sole survivors out of the fifteen males that landed upon the island. They were both, and more particularly Young, of a serious turn of mind; and it would have been wonderful, after the many dreadful scenes at which they had assisted, if the solitude and tranquility that ensued had not disposed them to repentance. During Christian's lifetime they only once read the church service: but since his decease this had been regularly done every Sunday. They now, however, resolved to have morning and evening family prayers; to add afternoon service to the duty of the Sabbath; and to train up their own children, and those of their late unfortunate companions, in piety and virtue. In the execution of this resolution, Young's education enabled him to be of the greatest assistance; but he was not long suffered to survive his repentance, having died soon after. Adams steadily and successfully continued the good work which he and his late companion had begun.

The children acquired such a thirst after Scriptural knowledge, that Adams in a short time had little else to do than answer their interrogatories, and put them in the right way. As they grew up, they acquired fixed habits of morality and piety; their colony improved, intermarriage occured, and they soon formed a happy and well-regulated society—the merit of which belongs to Adams, and tends to redeem the errors of his former life. He died, honored and respected, on the 4th March, 1829, aged sixty-five.

Such was the information obtained by Captain Beechy. He found, on surveying the island, that it was no more than about seven miles in circumference, the abrupt, rocky coast rising to about 1,050 feet above the sea. The population had then augmented to eighty persons, who, being descendants of Europeans and native women, still form an interesting link in person intellect and habits between the European and Polynesian races. They are tall and robust, with black, glossy hair. Since Captain Beechy's visit, ships are constantly touching at the island.

We now come to the most recent account of the little colony. This, singularly enough, is supplied by the successor of the first ship sent out to seek the Bounty—namely, the *Pandora*, which arrived at Portsmouth only a few months ago. She touched at Pitcairn's Island in July, and found that its population had increased to 149 souls; seventy-five males and seventy-four females. Of these, we have seen the following interesting analysis: The "oldest inhabitant" is a Tahitian woman, aged eighty, widow of Edward Young, the midshipman. There are also two men of the first generation—one of them a son of John Adams, named Arthur; and the other a son of Mathew Quintal, named George. There are also seven females of the first generation, of whom three are daughters of Adams, and the rest of Fletcher Christian, Young, Mills and M'Coy. The remainder are children of the second and third generation. There are eight marriageable males and seven marriageable females.

Other information brought by the Pandora reveals that, during the last five years, one-fifth of the population have been born. The healthiness of the climate may be judged of from the low rate of mortality. Since 1831, there have been only sixteen deaths; four of them accidental, four of fever, one of disease of the ear, one of the heart, one of cancer, one of consumption, two of influenza, one in childbirth and one in infancy. The diseases most prevalent are asthma and catarrh, which prevail mostly among the females; bilious attacks are frequent, but slight, and easily give way to treatment. Influenza had visited the island during the last seven years, and caused two deaths.

The inhabitants are industrious, especially the females. They all rise with the sun, and retire to rest very early. The men are occupied chiefly in cultivating the ground and carpentering; several of the young men are good at cabinet-work and as blacksmiths. From August to November, they have plenty of employment, digging yams, also planting them, with bananas and potatoes, weeding, &c.; and when not busily employed, they generally meet in the morning, and, if the weather is favorable, go fishing; while on Saturdays they go out hunting for the Sunday's dinner. The Sabbath is still kept most strictly.

The females usually assist in the cultivation of the ground, preparing thatch for the houses, and, in fact, are more employed than the men; they are generally very strong, many of them being able to carry a barrel of potatoes down to the landing place, the path to which is very rugged and steep, and in the rainy season very difficult to ascend or descend.

The food of the inhabitants is chiefly yams and potatoes, animal food two or three times a week. Fish is becoming scarce. Bed clothes are generally manufactured by the females, from a species of mulberry. Wearing apparel they obtain from the whale ships, in exchange for the produce of the island. Cotton cloth is much wanted, and among the other scarce articles are blankets, woollens and soap.

The jurisprudence of this primitive community is exceedingly simple On the first day of each year, a chief magistrate and councellor are elected; all persons, male and female, over sixteen years of age, being voters. The chief magistrate then chooses his counsellor or secretary. His duty is to convene meetings, and to preside over courts assembled to settle disputes. These, after the hearing of each side, are referred to a jury of five persons, who return a regular verdict. In criminal cases, the punishments are either labor or fines. If in civil disputes the decision of the jury is not satisfactory to both parties, they are allowed to appeal to the commander of the first of her majesty's ships-of-war which may touch at the island. A reference made to Captain Beechy while there, less on a judicial matter than on a point of conscience, is a touching instance of the scrupulous regard these people have for a vow, even when inconsiderately made:—wives, it may be imagined, are very scarce, as the same restrictions with regard to relationship exist as in England. George Adams, son of the patriarch, in his early days had fallen in love with Polly Young, a girl a little older than himself; but Polly, probably at that time liking some one else, and being at the age when young ladies' expectations are at the highest, had incautiously said she "*never would*" give her hand to George Adams. He nevertheless indulged a hope that she would one day relent, and to this end was unremitting in his endeavors to please her. In this expectation he was not mistaken; his constancy and attentions as he grew into manhood, his handsome form, softened Polly's heart into a regard for him, and had nothing passed before, she would willingly have given him her hand. But the vow of her youth was not to be gotten over, and the love-sick couple languished on from day to day, victims of the folly of early resolutions. The weighty case was referred for Captain Beechy's consideration; and the fears of the party were in some measure relieved by the result, which was, that it would be much better to marry than to continue unhappy in consequence of a hasty determination made before the judgment was matured. They could not, however, be prevailed on to yield to this decision, and the Blossom left them unmarried. Love, however, eventually proved too strong for over-wrought principle; and a letter from Pitcairn's Island, dated 19th of March, 1830, stated that George Adams was married to Polly Young, and had two sons.

Since Captain Beechy's visit, the average number of ships which anchor off the island has been eight or nine per annum, mostly Americans, who, it is satisfactory to state, are reported to behave well without exception. The last vessel that touched there was an English brig from New Zealand, bound to California with emigrants, there being eight English women amongst them. On the arrival of a ship on the island, no one is allowed to go on board before the pilot, who takes charge of the boats when landing, and provides for the captain when on shore; each family in rotation furnishing a pilot, or providing a substitute, who always expects a small remuneration from visitors for his service.

We have also gleaned the following particulars of the soil, culture and meteorology of Pitcairn's Island:—The soil is very rich but porous; a great proportion decomposed lava, the other a rich, black earth, and clayey ground; the climate is temperate; the thermometer from 59 to 89 degrees in the shade. The spring commences in August, which is harvest-time, and yams and potatoes are dug; and of potatoes there are two crops a year, which are planted in February and July, and dug in June and November. There are no regular trade-winds; in the summer months, the wind prevails mostly from East-Southeast to North. Northerly winds are generally light, often accompanied with rain or fog. When the wind is North, it invariably goes round to the Westward, from which quarter, and South-east, the strongest gales prevail. With wind from Southwest, it is generally clear weather with moderate breezes. In winter the prevailing winds are Southeast to East-Southeast. The animal and vegetable productions of the island are—goats, hogs and poultry; yams, sweet potatoes, the api-root and tano in small quantities; plantains, pines, melons, oranges, bread-fruit, sugar-canes, limes and the Brazilian plum. The only grain is maize.

From its distance from any other of the islands in Polynesia, Pitcairn's Island is perhaps the most isolated place in the world. To this may be ascribed the gratifying tenacity with which the people preserve their simple virtues and modesty. May the day be far distant when the vices of other nations find their way among them! We augur nothing favorable, however, from the visit of the ship on its way to California—to and from which it is not much out of the main track. It is to be hoped that the crimes of the "diggings" may never be imported among the descendants of the crew of the Bounty. —*Chamber's Edinburgh Journal.*

*Carteret discovered Pitcairn's Island in the corvette the *Swallow* in 1766. An account of his voyage was afterwards drawn up, together with Cook's first voyage, and published by Hawkesworth.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

Extracts from a "Discourse on Woman, by LUCRETIA MOTT," delivered at the Assembly Buildings, Philadelphia, December 17, 1849.

This age is notable for its works of mercy and benevolence—for the efforts that are made to reform the inebriate and degraded, to relieve the oppressed and suffering. Women as well as men are interested in these works of justice and mercy. They are efficient co-workers, their talents are called into profitable exercise, their labors are effective in each department of reform. The blessing to the merciful, to the peacemaker, is equal to man and woman. It is greatly to be deplored, now that she is increasingly qualified for usefulness, that any view should be presented, calculated to retard her labors of love.

Why should not a woman seek to be a reformer? If she is to shrink from being such an iconoclast as shall "break the image of man's lower worship," as so long held up to view; if she is to fear to exercise her reason, and her noblest powers, lest she should be thought to "attempt to act the man," and not "acknowledge his supremacy;" if she is to be satisfied with the narrow sphere assigned her by man, nor aspire to a higher, lest she should transcend the bounds of female delicacy, truly it is a mournful prospect for a woman. We would admit all the difference that our great and beneficent Creator has made in the relation of man and woman, nor would we seek to disturb this relation; but we deny that the present position of woman is her true sphere of usefulness, until the disabilities and disadvantages, religious, civil, and social, which impede her progress are removed out of the way.—These restrictions have enervated her mind and paralyzed her powers. While man assumes that the present is the original state designed for woman, that the *existing* "differences are not arbitrary nor the result of accident," but grounded in nature, she will not make the necessary effort to obtain her just rights, lest it should subject her to the kind of scorn and contemptuous manner in which she has been spoken of.

So far from her "ambition leading her to attempt to act the man," she needs all the encouragement she can receive, by the removal of obstacles from her path, in order that she may become a "true woman." As it is desirable that man should act a manly and generous part, not "mannish," so let woman be urged to exercise a dignified and womanly bearing, not womanish. Let her cultivate all the graces and proper accomplishments of her sex, but let not these degenerate in a kind of effeminacy, in which she is satisfied to be the mere plaything or toy of society, content with her outward adornings, and with the tone of flattery and fulsome adulation too often addressed to her. True, nature has made a difference in her configuration, her physical strength, her voice, &c.—and we ask no change—we are satisfied with nature. But how have neglect and mismanagement increased this difference! It is our duty to develope these natural powers by suitable exercise, so that they may be strengthened "by reason of use." In the ruder state of society, woman is made to bear heavy burdens, while her "lord and master" walks idly by her side. In the civilization to which we have attained, if cultivated and refined woman would bring all her powers into use, she might engage in pursuits which she now shrinks from as beneath her proper vocation. The energies of men need not then be wholly devoted to the counting-house and common business of life, in order that women in fashionable society may be supported in their daily promenades and nightly visits to the theatre and ball-room. * * *

The question is often asked, "What does woman want more than she enjoys? What is she seeking to obtain? Of what rights is she deprived? What privileges are withheld from her? I answer, she asks nothing as a favor, but as right; she wants to be acknowledged as a moral, responsible being. She is seeking not to be governed by laws, in the making of which she has no voice. She is deprived of almost every right in civil society, and is a cypher in the nation, except in the right of presenting a petition. In religious society her disabilities, as already pointed out, have greatly retarded her progress. Her exclusion from the pulpit or ministry—her duties marked out for her by her equal brother man, subject to creeds, rules and disciplines made for her by him—this is unworthy her true dignity. In marriage, there is assumed superiority, on the part of the husband, and admitted inferiority, with the promise of obedience, on the part of the wife. This subject calls loudly for examination, in order that the wrong may be redressed. Customs, suited to darker ages in Eastern countries, are not binding upon enlightened society. The solemn covenant of marriage may be entered into without these lordly assumptions, and humiliating concessions and promises. * * *

It is with reluctance that I make the demand for the political rights of woman; because this claim is so distasteful to the age. Woman shrinks, in the present state of society, from taking any interest in politics. The events of the French Revolution, and the claim for woman's rights, are held up to her as a warning. But let us not look at the excesses of woman alone, at that period; but remember that the age was marked with extravagances and wickedness in men as well as women. Indeed, political life abounds with these excesses, and with shameful outrage. Who knows but that if woman acted her part in governmental affairs there might be an entire change in the turmoil of political life? It becomes man to speak modestly of his ability to act without her. If woman's judgment were exercised, why might she not aid in making the laws by which she is governed? Lord Brougham remarked that the works of Harriet Martineau upon Political Economy were not excelled by those of any political writer of the present time. The first few chapters of her "Society in America," her views of a Republic, and of Government generally, furnish evidence of woman's capacity to embrace subjects of universal interest.

Far be it from me to encourage woman to vote, or to take an active part in politics, in the present state of our government. Her right to the elective franchise, however, is the same, and should be yielded to her, whether she exercise that right or not. Would that men, too, would have no participation in a government based upon the life-taking principle—upon retaliation and the sword. It is unworthy a Christian nation. But when, in the diffusion of light and intelligence, a convention shall be called to make regulations for self-government, on Christian, non-resistant principles, I see no good reason why woman should not participate in such an assemblage, taking part equally with man.

Walker, of Cincinnati, in his introduction to American law, says; "With regard to political rights, females form a positive exception to the general doctrine of equality. They have no part or lot in the formation or administration of government. They cannot vote or hold office. We require them to contribute their share in the way of taxes, to the support of government, but allow them no voice in its direction. We hold them amenable to the laws when made, but allow them no share in making them. This language, applied to males, would be the exact definition of political Slavery; applied to females, custom does not teach us so to regard it." Woman, however, is beginning so to regard it.

A VILLAGE CURATE.

THE condition of the Reformed Church in Hungary does not by any means deserve the epithet of "brilliant," even in our own days; but the present village pastors are most enviable situated in comparison to their brethren of fifty years ago. Still the life of the Rev. Esaias Tengelyi, though full of privations, was rich in enjoyment. He loved his cottage, its straw-covered roof, and the brown rafters of its ceiling. Sometimes, indeed he wished to have the windows of his room a little larger, and he went even so far as to take the resolution of administering, at his own expense, to this drawback to the comforts of his home. The large stove, too, which served also the purpose of an oven, made his room preposterously small, and on baking days it threw out a greater quantity of heat than was consistent with comfort. The neighboring curates, whenever they came to pay their respects to the Rev. Esaias, were violent in their strictures upon the parish of Bard, for neglecting to provide their pastor's study with a decent flooring: nay, more, the good man was seriously reproved, and earnestly adjured to follow the example of his brethren in office, who had successfully petitioned the synod respecting the gross indecency of pastoral clay floors. But Tengelyi could not be moved to stir in behalf his house; perhaps he liked it better as it was. Its windows were, indeed, small; but then he had often sat by them reading the Scriptures; and they had seen the roses on his wife's cheek. The stove was large, of course it was,—but in winter it offered a convenient and warm seat; and the clay floor of his study was the same on which his father's feet had trod, when he was meditating his sermons, while the son made his first attempt to stand on a pair of trembling little legs. After all, there was nothing like the window, the stove, and the floor, for a countless number of sweet and tender emotions were connected with them. Esaias Tengelyi was happy; he felt that the largest window, that the smallest stove, and the most splendid floor of old oak, could not add to his happiness.

But that happiness could be lessened. The pastor's wife died, and the heart which had harbored so much bliss was henceforth the home of bitter sorrow. Tengelyi gave no words to his anguish, nor did he strive to add to or lessen his grief; but his friends felt that time was as nothing to the sorrow of his heart, and that his hopes and wishes were not on this side of the grave. His little son, Jonas, was the only tie which bound the old pastor to the world. The boy was but four years of age when his mother died; what would become of him if he were also bereft of his father? People have scarcely a heart for their own children; how then is an orphan to fare for love? And the boy was most beautiful, when he cast his deep blue eyes upwards to the father's sad face! His voice had the tones of that dear voice which taught him his first words; his yellow locks were smooth and orderly, as if fresh from his mother's hands; what was to become of the child on this wide earth, and with no kindred, but his parents in the grave? Tengelyi would not be comforted, but a sense of his duty kept him alive.

Thus did the first years pass away. When Jonas had completed his eighth year, his father commenced his education. The old pastor's plan was extremely simple. He made the child ask questions, and answered them in a manner which was at once explicit and adapted to the boy's capacities. He had no idea of making his son a phenomenon; on the contrary, he did all in his power to limit his mental activity to a narrow circle, to prevent his being confused by a variety of subjects. The classical languages, as far as Jonas could understand them, and the rudiments of natural and political history, were all that old Esaias taught his son: they were all he thought necessary for that son's future vocation.

The poor curate's library contained but few books, but among them was a great treasure; namely, a copy of Plutarch—a relic of college life, with a portrait of the hero to each biography. This illustrated copy of Plutarch was the only book of its kind in the vicarage, and indeed in the village of Bard. Jonas passed many hours in looking at the solemn faces of the classic heroes, nor was it long before he knew all their names and actions; and though the old pastor regretted that the book was not an illustrated Bible, by which means he might impress upon his boy's mind the history and the deeds of the heroes of our faith, still his heart grew big with joy when the child expatiated on the virtues of Aristides, or (his little cheeks glowing all the while) told of the death of Leonidas and Socrates. An old Esaias blessed the pagan author who wrote the book, and the college-chum who made him a present of it, and even the very printer who had produced it.

At times, when old Tengelyi was from home, Jonas would follow his fancies through the dark shades of the woods. He would sit on the ruins of Bard Castle, looking at the forest-clad mountains and the wide distant plain, and there he sat and pondered until the sun went down and the evening breeze woke him from his dreams.

Children, when isolated,—that is to say, when they are deprived of the society of other children,—are apt to become dreamers; and this was young Tengelyi's case. His dreams were of a dangerous kind, and his conversation was such that his hearers became convinced of fate having destined that boy to be either very great or very wretched.

Old Esaias did not indeed suffer from these apprehensions. His son's enthusiasm, his hatred of tyranny, his love of his kind, proved nothing to old Tengelyi but that Jonas would turn out a first-rate village pastor. He never dreamt of this enthusiasm being applied to other purposes than those of the pulpit; and he did all in his power to develop the talents in so hopeful a preacher. He enlarged on the sufferings of the poor and the cruelty of the rich; on the equality of mankind before God, and the duties we owe to our fellow-men."

Old Esaias Tengelyi continued meanwhile in his life of tranquility and contentment. His humble dwelling grew still more quiet when his son left it; and the grey-headed pastor walked lonely among the fruit-trees of his garden, where he formerly used to watch the gambols of his child; but the serenity of his mind was still the same. His life passed away like the course of a gentle stream which mixes with the ocean. Esaias was aware that his days were numbered; but there was nothing appalling in the thought. He was at peace with God and the world; and, though he grieved to leave his son, his soul yearned for her that had left him. His last remaining wish was to expire in the arms of his son. His wish was granted. Jonas returned to Bard, and a fortnight after his return his father was laid in the grave. The poor of Bard wept with Jonas, for they too were the old man's children; a simple stone with an inscription of rude workmanship (for the hands of poor peasants wrought it) marks the last resting-place of Esaias Tengelyi.—*A Romance of Hungarian Life* By Raron Eötvös (London).

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

A SOLEMN belief prevails in Russia that no Czar can reign more than twenty-five years in Russia, and next year is the fatal term.

——THE Queen has been pleased to confer the honor of knighthood upon Thomas Noon Talfourd, Esq., one of the judges of her majesty's court of common pleas.

——SOME ignorant and infatuated persons in Cardington, Rushbury, and other parishes are signing a petition to the Almighty to chain the devil, &c.—*Eddowes' Shrewsbury Journal.*

——THE Rev. Mr. Sullivan, parish priest of Kinnan, says, speaking authoritatively, that the number of deaths in the county of Kerry from starvation and consequent disease, in the last three years, exceeds 40,000!

——GODFREY SCHADOW, the celebrated founder of the Dusseldorf School, and President of the Academy of Arts and Sciences at Berlin, died on the 28th ult., at the advanced age of eighty-six.

——BY a return just issued from the Post Office, it appears that the total number of letters delivered in the United Kingdom during the past year was 337,500,000, while the total in 1839, under the old system, was 76,000,000.

——THE principal of an academy, in his advertisement, mentioned his female assistant, and the "reputation for teaching which she bears," but the printer—careless fellow—left out the "which," so the advertisement went forth commending the lady's reputation for "teaching she bears."

——M. EUGENE SUE has addressed a letter to the Socialists of the department of the Saone-et-Loire, declining the honor of representing them in the Legislative Assembly, his literary labors demanding, he adds, his exclusive attention.

——THE *Lancet* mentions a report that the cholera has destroyed a great many slaves at Havannah; and it is added, that a number of well-armed and equipped slavers have sailed for the coast of Africa, to get a fresh supply of blacks.

——A GIANT tree, which has for centuries been an attraction to the town of Ross, has been destroyed by fire. The "old oak of Ross" is supposed to have been 1500 years old. The circumference at base was fifteen yards, and 11 yards at three feet from the ground. Some boys lighted a fire in its trunk,

——THE *Morning Chronicle* says: "That Southey's library—which was one of the finest possessed by any private gentleman in the country—though collected at an enormous outlay, sold for a mere song when brought to the hammer."

——M. LAMARTINE.—This distinguished man made his appearance in the French Legislature for the first time since his election on Saturday; he took his seat on the borders of the Mountain, General Cavaignac was among the first to greet him on his return, and was followed by members belonging to all political parties.

——*Galignani* says: "An idea of the extent of the mischief committed during the days of February may be formed from the fact that the court of liquidation of the civil list is about to sell by auction 50,000 lb. of broken glass and crystal, belonging to the furniture and services of the old Palais National. Broken porcelain has been already sold for 6000f."

——THE *Athenæum* says: "The Danish Ochlenschlager is dead;—the most fertile and famous dramatic poet that the Scandinavian kingdoms have produced. He died of apoplexy, in the seventy-first year of his age. A poet counts for something in Scandinavia. Such marks of public mourning as we reserve here for the more material royalties have signalized the Danish loss and the people's sense of it. The three theatres of Copenhagen were ordered to be closed for a week."

——THE Paris correspondent of the *Medical Times* states: "M. Rames has discovered that the bromuret of potassium enjoys the property of bringing on a degree of insensibility little less than that possessed by ether. When administered to the extent of five drachms during the day, it throws the patient into a kind of drunken torpor which continues for several days."—[There are various drugs which produce a "drunken torpor" which lasts something more than "several days," that might supercede, one would think, the necessity of these new inventions.]

——THE Earl of Harewood has actually issued the following ukase: "Notice is hereby given, that any cottager, being a tenant of the Earl of Harewood, who shall from the date hereof take in any lodger, or whose son or daughter shall marry and bring home to the cottage wife or husband, without having previously obtained permission from the Earl of Harewood, shall receive notice to quit, which notice will be strictly enforced; and, if in the employment of the said earl, shall be discharged."

——REPEAL ASSOCIATION.—Mr. John O'Connell on Monday informed his Burgh-quay friends that he intended to retain his seat for Limerick until some important question came before the House, and if unable then to attend, he would insist on his constituents' acceptance of his resignation, as his "circumstances,"—the old story—would not permit him to lead a parliamentary life. The rent was but £9 some odd shillings and pence—Mr. O'Connell attributing this marked "want of confidence" to the fact of his having entered into any negotiation with the Young Ireland party. "So you see," pathetically whined the honorable gentleman, "I am blamed by both parties," and the result is an empty exchequer and as empty benches at Conciliation-hall.—*Times*

——THE (London) *Weekly News* says to a correspondent, W. D. (Lancashire.)—"We are bound in courtesy to acknowledge the receipt of your 'fue verseas on the lamentabel death of the queen over the lian,' with your permission to 'correct ane word rong speled in the composement.' We are sorry that our limits are so contracted that we cannot afford space for the entire poem, but probably our readers, and the pathetic world generally, will be satisfied with the first verse only:—

'The queen over the lian is goan
Alas she's no moar in our vue
She silentlay laes in the toum
Beneath the hilick the soad and the due
Scars seventeen years in lifs boslen stage
this sweet littel mad she had been
till hir relations did sigh with A tear in thar eye
for the death of thar butful queen."

——A POPISH PREACHER IN FRANCE.—The well-known M. Ratisbonne has, it appears, created a tremendous commotion at Lisieux by preaching what is called a socialist sermon, or rather a sermon in which he sternly rebuked the wealthy for their callous indifference to the poor (a rebuke richly wanted in this country,) and menaced them with terrible vengeance at the coming revolution This M. Ratisbonne, by the way, is one of the itinerant preaching clergy constantly employed here, and a marvellous story is related of him too. He was a Jew by birth and education, and, it is said, happened to stray one day into a church at Rome, where he was much struck by a picture of the Virgin. As he was gazing at it a column of light suddenly issued from the picture, and the Virgin, in *propria persona*, stepped forward, and condemned his Jewish disbelief, and ordered him to conform to Christianity. Thereupon Ratisbonne fell on his knees, and remained for some time entranced; and when he returned to consciousness the vision had departed. He hastened back to Paris a converted man—made over to the church a great part of his fortune, which was considerable—obtained permission to enter a seminary, and, after going through the usual course of study, was ordained—since which, being gifted with eloquence, he has been employed as a travelling preacher. This absurd story of his conversion is impudently palmed off on the public—accounts of it are printed with the sanction of the bishops—and cheap engravings representing it are spread about by thousands. Consequently, wherever he goes Ratisbonne is a "lion," and to see and hear him, churches are thronged by the gaping multitude with almost as much interest as would be manifested to see Van Amburgh or Rachel.

——THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT OF KINDNESS IN THE MADHOUSES.—A magic change came over the dismal building; and the gloomy, barred, and bolted prison became the cheerful and kindly asylum. The high, dark walls that had shut out the green fields of the earth and the golden light of heaven, sank, till the country round was seen in all its healthful verdure and soothing beauty. The bars dropped from before the narrow windows as if melted by the sunbeams that came streaming in, or swept away by the sweet air that now gushed through them. And where the bars had frowned, birds in cages sang, and flowers blossomed; till the damp, dark dungeons that once had echoed with the clanking of chains and reeked with the fetid atmosphere, were now cheerful chambers, pleasant with melody and perfume. There was warmth for the winter, and coolness and shade for the summer. There were lightsome places set apart for the tranquil, the sick, and the helpless; and places as lightsome, too, though more secure, for the unruly, the noisy, and the violent. And those who for years had never moved a limb, or had a peaceful thought, were now busy forgetting their delusions in the work-shops and work-rooms, the farm and the dairy, the smithy, the printing-office, and the playground, that gave new life and health to the place. Those who, a little while back, would have been chained in wooden troughs, now made soft bedding for their suffering brethren. Those whose bodies would once have been strapped to the coercion-chair, were now busy making easy seats for the feeble and the helpless. Those whose limbs would have been griped fast by leg-locks, were now hard at work tilling the sweet-smelling earth; while others, whose muscles would have been stiffened with iron belts and braces, fashioned toys and puzzles for the childish.—*The Brothers Mayhew's Magic of Kindness.*

——A WRITER in the (London) *Weekly News*, speaking of the law of entail and primogeniture, says:

"Formerly a chieftain or territorial magnate was accustomed to support all the members of his family and clan; but now, with increased wealth, our large proprietors have managed to free themselves in a great measure from all such onerous responsibilities. Instead of finding subsistence for all of the same lineage or name, they do not so much as provide generally for their own families. As soon as they possibly can, they throw them upon the care of their kind country; and their immense rentals fall into the hands of their eldest sons, and into theirs alone. Some of these favored representatives of noble or ancient houses possess a dozen or half a dozen palaces, and £200,000 or even £300,000 a year! And here it may very naturally be asked, how is this prodigious, this almost incredible sum spent? Perhaps in securing independence for their younger children, and all the necessaries, and some of the comforts of life for the hard-working peasantry on their estates? No such thing. These natural and urgent claims are almost totally neglected. Their sons are placed in over-paid and unnecessary offices at the expense of the nation; these help to constitute the genteel poor-fund, and which, as I remarked in a former letter, is most ingeniously dovetailed into every branch or department of the public service. Our 150 admirals is one specimen of this artful policy, and it would be easy to cull others equally instructive from the church, the army, and the colonies. And the peasants, who wear out their strength and lives in cultivating their fields under the strict and, in too many cases, severe mastership of their tenants, who, being racked with high rents, are almost driven into this severity,—these unfortunate men are hardly allowed enough to keep soul and body together."

——ANECDOTE OF LOUIS XVI.—The royal library of Brussels has just acquired from the library of M. Brissard, of Ghent, a curious and rare volume. It is a copy, printed on satin, of the second edition of a work entitled "Moral and Political Maxims," taken from Telemachus, on the science of kings, and the happiness of the people, printed in 1706, by Louis Auguste, Dauphin (afterwards Louis XVI.), for the court only. A manuscript note at the head of the copy contains the following anecdote:—"As soon as the Dauphin had concluded the printing of the volume he had a few copies bound to make presents. The first was for Louis XV., his ancestor. His majesty, opening the volume, read the article, and said to the Dauphin, 'Monsieur the Dauphin, your work is finished, break the type.' The article was as follows:—'When kings have once broken down the barriers of good faith and honor they cannot re-establish the confidence necessary to them, nor bring back to the principles of virtue and justice the men whom they have taught to despise them; they become tyrants, their subjects rebel, and nothing but a sudden revolution can bring their power to a normal state. The original edition of this volume was made in the very apartment of the Dauphin himself, then aged twelve years. The Count of Provence (Louis XVIII.) and the Count d'Artois, (Charles X.) were present at the lithographic operations. The dauphin printed every copy."—*Presse.*

——DECK PASSENGERS ON THE MISSISSPPI.—It was impossible not to entertain a deep feeling of commiseration for the unfortunate *deck hands*, who were working their passages—poor creatures! down to New Orleans. For five days and nights had these miserable people been exposed to the inclemency of the weather, being hardly worked during the whole time, especially when the steamer happened to get aground. Their labor was so extremely severe, what with taking in wood, getting cargo on board, &c., and they seemed most of them so thoroughly worn out, that some of the "first class" passengers at length took pity on their hard fate. After communicating one with another, and inviting others to express their sentiments (for the importance attached to *public* opinion is well known in America), a deputation was formed to wait upon the captain, and make known to him the disapprobation which the passengeus felt bound to express at the cruel and tyranical manner in which the Ir